F. 13. 24

Catholicks NO IDOLATERS.

Or a Full

Refutation

Of Doctor

STILLINGFLEETS

Unjust Charge of Idolatry

Against the

CHURCH OF ROME.

Let not Them who charge the Pope to be Antichriſt, and the Papiſts Idolaters, lead the People by the Noſe, to believe that they can prove their Suppoſition, when They cannot. Mr. Thorndike, *Juſt Weights and Meaſures*, Chap. 2.

Printed in the Year, 1672.



5-88:03

TO THE QUEEN.

MADAM,

THE Book, before which I presume to fix Your *Royal Name*, being the Product of some Hours defalkt from Your *Majesties* Service, and the Subject of it *Polemical*, set me for some time at *dispute* with my self, whether I should let it venture to knock at Your Closet-Door. Your Early *Preventing* the *Sun* to praise your *Creator*, and Constant *Retirements* from the Tumults of the World (which I could wish were as much *imitated* as they are *admired*) to *Unite* Your Soul by Prayer with



5-88:03

TO THE QUEEN.

MADAM,

THE Book, before which I presume to fix Your *Royal Name*, being the Product of some Hours defalkt from Your *Majesties* Service, and the Subject of it *Polemical*, set me for some time at *dispute* with my self, whether I should let it venture to knock at Your Closet-Door. Your Early *Preventing* the *Sun* to praise your *Creator*, and Constant *Retirements* from the Tumults of the World (which I could wish were as much *imitated* as they are *admired*) to *Unite* Your Soul by Prayer with

Him, and eſtabliſh it in that perfect *Peace*, which can only be enjoyed in becoming *One Spirit* with Him, made me judg ſome Treatiſe of *Divine Love* (which might miniſter matter to the Sacred Fire, that burns continually upon the Altar of *Your Heart*) would ſuit much better with that *Better Part*, which you have choſen with *Mary*, than a Book of *Controverſy*. Here then my thoughts were at a ſtand, how to make my Addreſs without *Offence*; And I was ready to complain with *Martha*, that *I was left alone*; when that Admirable Mixture of *Clemency* and *Zeal*, which diſpoſes Your Heroick Mind, not only to forgive *Offences* of this Nature; but to eſteem and cheriſh them as *Pious*; convinc'd me, I muſt be guilty of a greater Treſpaſs, ſhould I doubt of obtaining either Your *Pardon* or *Protection*.

Nor was this All. The Glorious

Saint

Saint,* (whoſe Name You bear,) as ſhe encourag'd me with her Example to engage in this Controverſy; ſo much more to recommend my endeavours to Your *Majeſties* Patronage. It was *Her* buſineſs to convince and reduce *Idolaters* to the *Faith* of Chriſt: *Mine*, is to defend the *Faith* which Chriſt planted in his Church, from the Imputation of *Idolatry*. An Aſperſion ſo foul and Blaſphemous, that it betrays the Forger‖ of it to be, what the *Anagram* of his Name expreſſes, a ſecond *Lucian*. Blaſphemous, I ſay: For who-ever will undertake to maintain the *Charge*, muſt at the ſame time profeſs that *Chriſt*, who commanded us under pain of damnation to *hear his Church*, hath permitted Her to *require* and *enjoin* her Children for many hundreds of years together, to commit *Idolatry* (as my

* S. *Catharine.*

‖ *Calvin, Anagr. Lucian.*

Adverſary contends) parallel to that of the *Heathens*. And conſequently that *Mahomet*, (that grand Impoſtor) whoſe Followers have been preſerved by the Grounds he laid, for above a Thouſand Years, from falling into Idolatry, had more *Wiſdom* and *Power* to contrive and carry on his deſign, than the *Son* of *God*: and that our *Fore-Fathers* in this Land, had better have been converted to *Judaiſm*, or *Turciſm*, than to *Chriſtianity*, as they were.

Theſe, *Madam*, are the deteſtable Conſequences of charging *Idolatry* upon the *Catholick-Roman* Church; which, as they muſt needs ſtrike horrour into Your Religious Soul (nay even of any who values the name of Chriſtian) So I thought it my *Duty*, being ſingled out by a particular defiance from this new Abettor of it, to appear in Vindication of that *Faith* (on which Your MAJESTY

grounds

grounds Your Hope of Heaven, and whoſe Influence hath enrich'd Your Mind with all the Nobleſt Vertues) from ſo unjuſt and ſcandalous a ſlander. Which nevertheleſs I have endeavoured to manage with that *Moderation* and *Temper*, as (Circumſtances duly weigh'd) can neither create juſt Offence in the diſſenting Party; nor I hope render it miſ-deſerving to be preſented to Your Majeſties View, by

MADAM,

Your Majeſties

Moſt Humble and Moſt Obedient Subjekt and Servant

T. G.

THE PREFACE.

Chriſtian Reader,

THough I never deſign'd to trouble Thee with any thing in Print, eſpecially in a Contentious way (from which thoſe who know me, think me to be naturally averſe) yet now, I am forc'd to appear publickly in defence of a little Paper, which Another hath Printed for me. Three Years were almoſt elapſed, and the ſubject of that Paper quite worn out of my Memory, when a Particular Meſſenger from Dr. Stillingfleet delivers me in Anſwer to it, a large Book intitled, A Diſcourſe concerning the Idolatry practiſed in the Church of Rome, &c. As Civility oblig'd me to return thanks for ſuch a Preſent, to a Perſon, to whom I thought I had been unknown; ſo it had been great dulneſs not to look upon it with the ſame regard, that Men look upon a Glove, when ſent by a Perſon, with whom they have happened formerly to have ſome difference. Hereupon my thoughts preſently began

to

to incline me to meditate a return both to his Civility *and* Challenge, *at leaſt as to the Principal Heads contain'd in his Book; but finding in his* Preface, *the* performances *of thoſe, who had (as occaſion ſerv'd) replied to ſome Paſſages of his* Rational Account, *compared by Him to* the way that Rats anſwer Books, by gnawing ſome of the Leaves of them, *and that He proclaimed a general defiance to All* to come into the Open Field, from which, *he ſaith*, they had of late ſo wiſely with-drawn themſelves, *I eaſily conceiv'd he would not want many abler Adverſaries, who would take themſelves to be concern'd to ſtand up for the Publick cauſe of* GOD's Church, *and his* Saints. *Nor was I deceived in my expectation, as thoſe* Learned Treatiſes *witneſs, which have been written againſt Him upon this occaſion: Some of them in Vindication of the* Devotion *of the* Roman Church, *and of the* ſanctity *of thoſe Perſons whom he traduces: Others againſt his* Principles: One *to ſhow how he* contradicts *himſelf; and another compendiouſly* refuting *his whole* Book: *All which I ſuppoſed would coſt him a larger time to anſwer, than he tells us he ſpent in writing and pointing the Book it ſelf, which he ſaith, was but from about* Chriſtmas *to* Midſumer, *at what time it came forth. This made me waver a while, after I had applyed my thoughts to the Confutation of what* firſt *occurr'd in his*

Title

Title and Book, viz. The Charge of Idolatry, *which he moſt unjuſtly fixes upon the* Church of Rome; *whether I ſhould expoſe them to publick view or no. But then conſidering the* Foulneſs *of the* Charge, *the particularneſs of the* Challenge, *and the* General Expectation *to ſee him traced ſtep by ſtep, (which was the deſign I had undertaken) I thought my ſelf oblig'd to commit them to the Preſs. And that the Reader may know what he is to expect from me, it is that I have endeavoured to make my ſelf* ſuch *an* Adverſary, *as the* Author of the Account, τῶ ϑαυμαστῶ. *Pag.* 14. *conceiv'd would be a great* pleaſure and content of heart to Dr. *St.* if he could meet with, *viz.* One who viewing his Aiery ſubtilties ſhould oppoſe him ſeriouſly, as if he were ſerious himſelf; and then diſtinguiſh, as if he were dealing with ſome ſolid Divine; and then ply him with Proofs and Teſtimonies; refell him by ſhorter Enthymems, and longer Syllogiſms; ſearch in what Mood and Figure he ſpeaks; and then tell him how his Conſequence flaggs, or Antecedent is Ambiguous, till he have conſumed a hundred Pages in refutation of a Trifle. *This I confeſs is a Character of my preſent Undertaking; though not to the full, becauſe in the Proſecution of it, I ſhall be forced over and above to lay open frequent* Contradictions, Calumnies, *and* Miſ-repreſentations

ſentations *of the words and ſenſe of Authors, which can be no great pleaſure nor content of heart to my Adverſary to ſee diſcover'd. I was in good hope to have been freed from this ungrateful task of laying open faults of this nature, (which cannot be treated of without being named, nor named without offence) by the fair promiſe he makes* to repreſent the matters in difference between us truly, report faithfully, and argue cloſely: *And this Hope made me for a good while not exact that ſeverity of quoting Authors, which is required and expected in the managing of Controverſy; But ſince the neceſſity he hath drawn upon himſelf, by defending ſo* Extravagant *a* Charge, *as that of* Idolatry *upon the* Roman Church, *hath made him too often forget ſo good a purpoſe, I muſt begg his pardon, if at length I take the freedome to make the Reader a little ſenſible of it, with that Plainneſs which the* Merits *of the* Cauſe *will not only* bear, *but* require: *Of which the Reader muſt be Judge.*

Whether the Laurels *he fancies he hath acquired from his Adverſaries, by their* declining, *as he ſaith,* Perſonal Conferences, *look as* green *and* freſh *to others, as to himſelf, I very much queſtion. For* Meetings *of this nature being hardly to be undertaken by* Catholicks *without expoſing themſelves to the Danger of being accounted* Bold *and* Inſolent, *and ſo of irritating His* Majeſty *and the* Government *againſt them.*

them; All ſober and impartial Men will eaſily judge, that they may be more prudently declined without prejudice to their cauſe; than Arguments in writing (which is a much more peaceable and ſatisfactory way of proceeding) be by their Adverſaries (who run no ſuch hazard) ſlighted, *either as* Inconſiderable, *or* upon account of buſineſs, *or* upon a reaſonable Preſumption that the Perſon concerned had already forſaken their Church. *Theſe (and ſuch like) may be* Prudential *Motives to* them, *to ſlight anſwering a Paper, and alſo for declining Perſonal Conferences, as ſometimes they have been; Yet they muſt not be allowed at any time, for* ſuch *to* Catholicks: *Nay, even their modeſt comportment towards Authority, muſt go for no other than a* Pretence *only of* hazard; *though we ſee a* Private Paper (*as* this *was, from which the Doctor hath taken occaſion to make all this noiſe) publiſhed in Print with ſuch Characteriſtical Notes of the Author, as might eaſily diſcover his Perſon, and in termes ſo Invidious, as were apt to create the greateſt Prejudice againſt him. Why elſe was he ſtiled (and that upon every poſt & corner)* a Revolted Proteſtant, *when* Roman-Catholick *might have ſufficed? And why was* He *made the* Propoſer *of the* Queſtions, *when the* Party *concerned* propoſed *them indifferently to* both?

As for the Paper *it ſelf (which is now become the Subject of Debate) what others may*

have

have thought *or* ſaid *of its* not *being* anſwered *I know not, but from my* Adverſary's *own* Relation: *nor doth the Perſon taxed in particular, remember any ſuch thing. Beſides I am certain, I never communicated any Copy of it, but to the Party, for whoſe ſatisfaction it was written. Yet ſince my Adverſary hath thought good to publiſh it, together with his own Anſwer to the two Queſtions, at the beginning of his Book: I have judg'd fit to do the ſame before mine: not that I except againſt any thing as miſ-repreſented in it, beſides ſome little Errors of the Preſs; but that I conceive it may be ſome Satisfaction to the Reader in the peruſing of this* Rejoinder, *to recur ſometimes to the firſt Papers; at leaſt that he may clearly ſee, that the* Charge *of* Idolatry, *was no way neceſſary to the* Reſolution *of the* Queſtions, *(as I ſhall ſhew more at large in the Firſt Chapter,) but meerly brought in by Him upon ſome* other Account, *which I am now to conſider.*

The Account Himſelf gives of reviving a Charge, *which for many Years had lain buried under the ruins of its own* Infamy, *was, as he pretends, to* Juſtify *more clearly the* Separation *of the* Church of England, *from the* Guilt *of* Schiſm. *For* this, *he ſaith,* lies open to the Conſcience of every Man, if the Church of Rome be guilty of Idolatry, our ſeparation can be no Schiſm either before God or Man, becauſe our Communion would be a

Sin,

Sin. *This is what he pretends.* *And* this Cauſe *indeed,* (*as Mr.* Thorndike *well obſerves*) would be more than ſufficient to Juſtify the ſeparation, did it appear to be true: *but then* on the other ſide, *ſaith he,* it charges the miſchiefs of the Schiſm upon thoſe who proceed upon it, before it be as Evident as the Miſchiefs are, which they run into upon it. So that ſhould the Church of England declare, that the change which we call Reformation, is grounded upon this ſuppoſition, I muſt then acknowledg, *ſaith he,* that we are Schiſmaticks. For the cauſe not appearing to me (as hitherto it hath not, and I think will never be made to appear to me) the ſeparation and the miſchief of it, muſt be imputed to them that make the change.——In plain terms, We (*of the Church of England*) make our ſelves Schiſmaticks by grounding our Reformation upon this pretence. *Thus Mr.* Thorndike, *whoſe* Judgment, *abetted by divers of the moſt* learned *and moſt* Judicious *Perſons of the Church of* England, (*and this is thought to be the reaſon why the Doctor's Book came forth without the publick ſtamp of an* Imprimatur *from any of its Biſhops*) *will ſtand as a convincing Prejudice againſt him, till he can make it* as evident *that the* Church *of* Rome *is guilty of* Idolatry, *as the* miſchiefs *are that have enſu'd upon it.*

This

This He saw was not possible to be done, and therefore laying those Divines *aside for Men of* more charity, than Judgment, *least he should be thought in so* severe *a* Censure, *to contradict the* sense *of* his Church (*which, he saith,* he hath so great a regard to) he undertakes to show that this charge of Idolatry hath been managed against the Church of Rome, by the greatest and most learned Defenders of it ever since the Reformation. *But if he have such a* regard *as he saith, for the* Church *of* England, *Why did he not appeal to her 39. Articles? For as himself saith* (p. 209.) *of the sense of the Church of Rome, that we are to appeal for it, not to the Writings of particular Doctors, but to the Decrees of her Councils; so in like manner for the sense of the* Church *of* England, *He ought to have appealed to Her Publickly-Authorized Articles? But in them the Church of England declares no such thing. For we see it hotly disputed between her Divines, whether any of the three Points instanced by the Doctor, viz.* Veneration of Images, Adoration of the B. Sacrament, and Invocation of Saints, *be* Idolatry, *or no: and those who side least with that Party, which are called Non-conformists, are for the Negative,* Viz. *that it is not Idolatry: whereas, if it had been the sense of the* Church *of* England *in those Articles, that it were* Idolatry *to do any of those things, they had by maintaining the contrary as*

erro-

erroneous, *incurr'd Excommunication*, ipſo facto, *as appears by the Canons Printed before the* 39 *Articles, ſet forth by Mr.* Rogers.

Here therefore the Doctor to maintain his charge *of* Idolatry *to be (as he calls it)* the receiv'd Doctrin and practice of the Church of England, *is forc'd to have recourſe to the* Book *of* Homilies; *and to the* Sentiments *of* Particular *Perſons, of which he cites no leſs than* Seventeen: *the greateſt part of whom I ſhall ſhow to be incompetent Witneſſes in the caſe, and the* reſt, *to ſpeak nothing to his Purpoſe.*

Firſt then for the Book *of* Homilies, *which he ſaith is* not barely allow'd, but ſubſcribed to as containing godly and wholſome Doctrine, and neceſſary for theſe times: *I anſwer, this doth not Evince that every particular Doctrin contained in it, is ſuch. And therefore Mr.* Thorndike *ſpeaking of* the very Homily againſt peril of Idolatry, *here urged by Dr. St. ſaith, that* in this particular he muſt have leave to think it fails, as it evidently doth in others. *And Biſh.* Mountague *ſaith*, The Book of Homilies contains a general Godly doctrin, yet it is not in every part the publick dogmatical doctrin of the Church. *And Dr.* Heylin *in his* neceſſary Introduction

Art. 35.

Epil. 3. part. p. 363.

Appeal, c. 23.

to Cyprianus Anglicus, *p.* 14. *tells us, that* the vehemence used in those Homilies, was not against Images as Intolerable in themselves, but as they might be made in those broken and unsetled times an occasion of falling. But that People being well instructed in the right use of them, Images may be still kept for good uses in Churches, and for stirring up of devotion, in which respect they were called, *saith he,* by Pope Gregory, and not unfitly, the Lay-men's Books.

As for the particular Doctors he cites, I except against little less than two parts of three of them, as Incompetent Witnesses in the Case. And in Order to this I shall take the same measure, the Doctor himself puts into my hand, when to shew the Testimony of Arch bishop Whitgift *to be valid in his cause, he premises that* none could be less suspected to be Puritanically inclined than He; *that is, I shall cast out of the List all those, who shall be found to have been* Puritans, *or* Puritanically *inclin'd. And first for his two Arch bishops* Whitgift *and* Abbot, *the* Former *(though otherwise a stiff Asserter of the Discipline of the Church of England) is known to have consented to the framing of the* Lambeth Articles; *and to have proposed them to the* Divines *of* Cambridge: *and the* latter *was so great a Favourer and Abetter*

Confer. at Hampton-Court. pag. 20-40.

Abettor of the Puritan Party, *that* to ſtop them in their full Carreer, *Dr.* Heylin *ſaith*, it was found neceſſary to ſuſpend Him from his Metropolitical Juriſdiction. *Cyprian. Angl. p.* 242. *Of Dr.* White, *the ſame* Heylin *reports*, (p. 135.) *that for Licenſing Biſhop* Mountague's Appello Cæſarem, *it was ſaid, that* White was turned Black. Jewel, Bilſon, *and* Davenant *were all excepted againſt by our late Soveraign* K. Charles I. *in his 3d. Paper to* Hinderſon, *Dr.* Fulk *alſo* (*in Matth.* 28. 46.) *is noted for abetting* Calvin *in his blaſphemous Opinion, that our Saviour Chriſt* ſuffered in his Soul the very pains of a damned Perſon upon the Croſs. Reynolds *and* Whitaker *are notorious for their ſiding with the* Puritans: *the latter being a great ſtickler for the* Lambeth Articles: *and the Former appearing publickly the* Fore-man *or* Champion *of that Party at the* Conference *at* Hampton-Court *againſt the* Church *of* England. *Biſhop* Uſher *and Biſhop* Downam *cannot be excuſed: The ſtory of the firſt is to be ſeen in* Cyprianus Anglicus, *p.* 271. *where after many Calviniſtical Opinions, of which the ſaid* Primate *was the Contriver in* Ireland, *Dr. Heylin ſaith*, he refuſed to receive the whole Body of the Canons made in the year 1603, becauſe he was afraid of bowing at the name of Jeſus, and ſome other Reverences, which

he neither practiſed, nor approved: *and* (p. 216.) *that his Book called* Gotteſcalchus, *had run the ſame Fate of being called in, with that of Biſhop* Downam's *about* Perſeverance, *but that* it ſeem'd not fit to put a publick diſgrace, upon the Primate of a Nation. *By all which it appears, that of* Seventeen *Authors He cites, to maintain his unjuſt* charge *of* Idolatry *upon the* Church *of* Rome, *to be the* ſenſe *of the* Church *of* England: *no leſs than* Eleven *are ſhown to have been downright* Puritans, *or* Puritanically *affected.*

For the Six *which remain, viz. Dr.* Jackſon, *Dr.* Field, Iſaac Caſaubon, *Biſhop* Andrews, *Arch biſhop* Laud, *and King* James, *whoever compares what the Doctor cites out of them, with what they write in other places; nay, whoever attentively conſiders but the very places cited by my Adverſary, ſhall find, that they do not impugn the* Doctrin *it ſelf of the* Church *of* Rome, *or the* practice conformable *to that* Doctrin; *but ſuch things as they conceived to be great* abuſes *in the* Practice *of it. For Dr.* Jackſon, *as cited by the Doctor, doth not ſay, that to give a honourary* Veneration *to* Images, *is* Idolatry: *but* to give divine honour to them, which *he ſaith,* the Papiſts do; *and the* Papiſts *themſelves deny. Biſhop* Andrews *in like manner, giveth for the reaſon of his charge, that* the Papiſts, do not meerly pray to the Saints to pray for them, but to

give

give what they pray for, themſelves; *and the Papiſts profeſs they do no ſuch thing.* Dr. Field *doth not charge the* Invocation *of* Saints, *with* Idolatry *and* Superſtition, *but ſpeaks only of the* Idolatry *and* Superſtition, *which he thought, but not truly,* was committed in it. *Arch-biſhop* Laud *alſo (as his own words declare) ſpeaks of* the practice of Adoration of *Images in the Modern Church of Rome, which he erroneouſly affirmeth to be* too like to Paganiſm. *And ſo K.* James, *in the place cited by the Doctor (had He not ſo ſoon forgot his promiſe of* reporting faithfully) *ſaith expreſly, that what He condemns, is* Adoring of Images (*viz. with Divine Worſhip*) praying to them, and imagining a kind of ſanctity to be in them, *all which are deteſted by* Catholicks. *And all that he cites out of* Iſaac Caſaubon, *when He was employed by the King to deliver His Opinion to Cardinal* Perron, *in the* Invocation of Saints, *was that the Church of* England *did affirm,* that ſome Particular Practices were joyned with great impiety. *So that it is not the* Doctrin *of the* Church *of* Rome, *if rightly practic'd, which theſe Authors condemn of* Idolatry, *but the* abuſes *they conceiv'd to be committed in the* practice *of it; as to give the Worſhip* due *to* God *to an* Image; *to* pray *to it; or imagin any* virtue *or* Divinity *to be in it; or to* pray *to the* Saints, *as to thoſe who are to* give *us what we*

pray for, themſelves; *All which are forbidden by the* 2*d.* Nicen Council, *and that of* Trent: *and for other practices which the Dr. occaſionally objects they ſhall be diſcuſs'd in the following Diſcourſe.*

This being ſo as I have ſhewn, and the Judgment of theſe Divines *differing only as* more *and* leſs *in the ſame kind, from what Mr.* Thorndike, *and other learned Proteſtants pretend, when they reprove ſome* practices *as* Idolatrous, *or at leaſt in danger to be* ſuch: *Theſe laſt* Six Authors *cited by the Doctor, ought to have been alledged for the contrary poſition of what He affirms, viz. That* the Church of Rome neither in her Doctrine, nor Practice, (conformable to her Doctrin) is guilty of Idolatry. *For whilſt they impeach only ſome* Practices, *which they judge different from the* Doctrine, *'tis manifeſt, they imply the* Doctrine *it ſelf, and* Practice, *if conformable to it,* not *to be* Idolatrous.

Here then let the Reader judge, whether Dr. St, *being (as He ſaith)* by command publickly engag'd in the defence of ſo excellent a cauſe, as that of the Church of England againſt the Church of Rome, *have not betray'd his* truſt, *and his* Church *too (if it be* his) *in advancing ſuch a* Medium *to juſtifie Her ſeparation, as contradicts the ſenſe of* that Church, *if it be to be taken from the ſentiments of thoſe who are eſteem'd Her* true *and*

Genuin

Genuin *Sons*; *and in the Judgment of ſome of them, makes it in* plain terms *to be* Schiſmatical: *Which yet will appear more clearly, if we conſider how this* Charge *of* Idolatry *ſubverts the very foundation of* Eccleſiaſtical Authority *in the* Church *of* England. *For it being a received* Maxime, *and not denyable by any one of common ſenſe, that* no Man can give to another that, which he hath not himſelf, *it lies open to the Conſcience of every man, that if the Church of Rome be guilty of* Hereſy, *much more if Guilty of Idolatry, it falls under the Apoſtles* Excommunication (*Gal.* 1. 8.) *and ſo remains depriv'd of the* lawful Authority *to uſe and exerciſe the* Power *of* Orders, *and conſequently the* Authority *of* Governing, Preaching, *and* Adminiſtring Sacraments, *which thoſe of the* Church *of* England *challenge to themſelves, as deriv'd from the Church of* Rome, *can be no* true *and* lawful Juriſdiction, *but* uſurped *and* Antichriſtian. *This is what follows againſt the* Church *of* England *from the* charge *of* Idolatry *upon the* Church *of* Rome; *and ſo much the more as iſſuing from his Pen, who in his* Irenicum (*a Book very* humbly tendred by him to Conſideration, *after the Re-ſettlement of* Epiſcopacy *in the* Church *of* England) *maintains that no particular* Form *of* Church Government *is* De Jure Divino; *but mutable, as the* Secular Magiſtrate, *with the advice of learn-*

ed and experienc'd Persons, shall see convenient for State *and* Church; *and particularly, that the main Ground for setling* Episcopal Government *in this Nation, was not any pretence of* Divine Right, *but* conveniency *to the* State, *and condition of the* Church *at the time of its Reformation*: *citing for it the Testimony of Arch bishop* Cranmer, *and others. Mr.* Foulis *I know, speaking of that Book, calls Him a* Bold Fellow that Published it, *and affirms, that* he little understood the compass and merit of that Controversie: *I like not the rudeness of these, and other expressions of like nature* He *there uses, and* I *forbear to repeat; yet I could willingly joyn with Him so far in Charity, as to impute it rather to* Inadvertence *than* design *in my Adversary, did not this new* charge *of* Idolatry *seem but too apparently to be but a* clinching *of the* nail *which He had* driven *before to the* Head. *For if the* Form *of* Church-Government *be mutable, as the Secular Power well-advised shall see* reason, *what greater reason can there be for the actual changing of it, than the nullity of its Jurisdiction? This hath made me wonder not a little, how the* Governours *of the* Church *of* England *could see their* Authority *so closely attacqued* (*at least so manifestly betrayed*) *by their pretended Champion, and not vindicate* themselves *and their* Jurisdiction *from the foul stain of* Antichristian, *which necessarily follows;*

follows, if the Church *of* Rome, *as He pretends, be guilty of* Idolatry; *and they derive together with their* Conſecration, *their* Epiſcopal Juriſdiction *from it. But I ſhall leave theſe things to thoſe whom it concerns; and betake my ſelf to my preſent buſineſs, which is to ſhow, that* the Church of Rome neither in her Doctrine, nor Practice, conformable to her Doctrine, is guilty of Idolatry. *And this I had done much ſooner, had not the Time ſpent in Tranſcribing, leaſt the Copy ſhould be ſurpized; the Difficulty of the Preſs, (which alſo encreaſed the Errata;) and other Employments not a few,* (for we *alſo* are none of thoſe happy Men, who have only one thing to mind) *retarded me in my deſign.*

ERRATA.

ERRATA.

IN the Preface, page 2. line 27. for *Pointing*, read *Printing*. p. 6. l. 8. r. *Dr. Taylor*; *that nether*. p 25. l. 15. r. *Queſtion thus put*. p. 35. l. 30. for *with*, r. *againſt*. p. 38. l. 8. for *cauſe*, r. *cauſe*. l. 9. for *ers*. r. *ers*. p. 41. l. 10 r. *writings*. p. 52. l. 28. r. *Beholders*. p. 64 l 12 r. *Irrepreſentableneſs*. p. 80. l. 11. for *the*, r. *his*. p. 81. l. 18. f. *ſeat* r. *State*. p. 87. l. 6. f. *did*, r. *drew*. p. 92. l. ult. r. *advantage*. p. 124. l. 11. add in the Marg. *Of the Church*, *l.* 3. *c.* 36. p. 134. l. 3. f. *croſs*, r. *Croſs*. p. 138. l. 23. r. *but that by* p. 140. l. ult. f. *raſhly*, r. *vainly*. p. 158. l. 27. r. *Obcacans*. l. 27. f. *that*, r. *that is*. p. 161. l. 25. for *magine*, r. *Imagine*. l. 28. for *Oracres*, r. *Oracles*. p 172. l. 5. for *in*, r. *me*. p. 178. l. 25. r. *in this matter*. p. 212. l. 27. for *honour*, r. *comfort*. p. 217. l 6. r. *Wherefore*. p. 246. l. 2. r. *Begotten Son*. p. 360. l. 30. f. *firſt*, r. *fifth*. p. 363. l. 2. after *for Bin*, put *St. Nicholas*; *for Ern*. p. 411. l. 7. 8. f. *Paul*. r. *Paula*. l. 23. *Praiſes* r. *prayes*. p. 448. l. 17. f. *Flood* r. *Floods*.

THE CONTENTS OF THE CHAPTERS.

PART I.

Of the Veneration of Holy Images.

Chap. 1. DR. Stillingfleet's *1st. and 2d. Answer to the First Question, shown not pertinent. Necessity of Communion with the Church of Rome, proved; and his Charge of Idolatry overthrown by his own Principles.* Pag. 1.

Chap. 2. *His chief Argument to prove the Church of Rome guilty of Idolatry, examin'd; and his Prepostorous ways of arguing laid open.* Pag. 17.

Chap. 3. *The Mystery of making the same Proposition sometimes an Article of Faith, and sometimes none. No expres Text against worshipping God by an Image. His first Proof from the Terms of the Law, manifestly groundless. The Arguments from St.* Austin's

Auſtin's *Judgment*, *and the Septuagint's Tranſlating the word* Peſel, *Idol*, *and not Image*, *reinforced.* Pag. 33.

Chap. 4. *The Doctor's Second Proof from the Reaſon of the Law*, *ſophiſtical. All Repreſentations of God*, *not diſhonourable to him*, *nor rejected as ſuch by the Church of England. The Proper Reaſon of the Law on God's part is aſſigned*; *and aſſerted to be the Supream Excellency of his Nature.* pag. 57.

Chap. 5. *Worſhip unlawful by the light of Nature*, *equally unlawful to Jews and Chriſtians. A ſtrange Paradox advanced by Dr.* Stillingfleet, *viz. What can an Image do to the heightning devotion*, *or raiſing Affections? How far his Devotion to the Sun may be allowed in the Judgement of St.* Leo. pag. 76.

Chap. 6. *Of the Notions and practice of the Wiſer Heathens in the matter of their Images. The Texts of St.* Paul, *Acts* 17. 24. *and* Rom. 1. 21. *explained. Some of the Doctor's Teſtimonies examined*; *in particular*, *the Relation He gives of what the Jeſuites did in* China. Pag. 95.

Chap. 7. *Of the* 2*d. General Council of* Nice, *call'd moſt irreverently by Dr. St.* that wiſe Synod. *His Conſtantinopolitan Father's Objections anſwered by* Epiphanius, *and his Anſwers ſhown to be good.* pag. 118.

Chap.

Chap.8. *The Dr.'s Objection from the Council of* Franckford *examin'd, and ſhown to be no advantage to his Cauſe.* pag.140.

Chap.9. *Of the Doctor's Third Proof from the Judgment, as He pretends, of the Law-giver. His Speculation concerning the* Golden Calves, *manifeſtly repugnant to the H. Scripture and Fathers. Mr.* Thorndike's *Judgement of the Meaning and Extent of the ſecond Commandment.* pag.153.

Chap.10. *What kind of honour the Church gives to Holy Images, explained; and the Doctor's mixing School-diſputes with matters of Faith, ſhown to be ſophiſtical.* pag.176.

Chap.11. *Of the Inſtances brought to explicate the nature of the honour given to Images, from the like Reverence given to the Chair of State, to the Ground, to the Ark, to the Name of* Jeſus, *&c. The weakneſs of the Doctor's Evaſions laid open; and His own Arguments return'd upon Him.* pag.193.

PART.

PART II.

Of the Adoration of the moſt Bleſſed Sacrament.

Chap. 1. *THE Practice of the Primitive Church in this Point. The Doctor's Argument to prove it to be Idolatry, built upon an Injurious Calumny, that* Catholicks believe the Bread to be God. *The ſenſe of his firſt Propoſition cleared, and the Proofs He brings for it, refuted.* pag. 221.

Chap. 2. *The true State of the Controverſie laid open, together with the Doctor's endeavours to miſ-repreſent it. His manner of arguing againſt the Adoration of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, equally deſtructive to the Adoration of Him as God.* pag. 243.

Chap. 3. *Of* Dr. St.'s *Scruple about the Hoſt's not being conſecrated for want of Intention in the Prieſt: and his miſtake of the true Reaſon of giving Adoration to Chriſt in the Sacrament.* pag. 256.

Chap. 4. *His Fundamental Principle of judging of matters propoſed to our Belief by Senſe and Reaſon, ſhown to be abſurd in it ſelf, and deſtructive to Chriſtianity.* p. 272.

Chap.

Chap.5. *A Check to the Doctor's bigg words againſt the Grounds of Tranſubſtantiation. With a New Example of* reporting faithfully *(as he calls it) the words and ſenſe of an Author.* pag.294.

Chap.6. *Dr.* Taylor's *Argument in behalf of Catholicks, ſuppoſing them miſtaken in the belief of Tranſubſtantiation, not anſwered by Dr. St. The Parallel of ſuch a ſuppoſed miſtake, with that of Idolaters, ſhown to be a real and very groſs miſtake in Himſelf.* pag.317.

PART III.

Of the Invocation of Saints.

Chap.1. *THE Doctrine of the Church of Rome in this Point, ſuppoſed by Dr.* St. *to be Idolatry, but not proved. The diſparity between the Worſhip given by Catholicks to the Saints, and that of the Heathens to their Inferiour Deities laid open.* pag.333.

Chap.2. *What kind of Honour Catholicks give to the Saints. The Teſtimonies of* Origen, *and St.* Ambroſe *explained. Of the practice of making Addreſſes to Particular Saints.* pag.353.

Chap.

Chap. 3. *What kind of Worſhip of Angels was condemned by St.* Paul, Theodoret, *&c. with a farther diſplay of the diſparity between the Heathens Worſhip of their Inferiour Deities, and that given by Catholicks to Holy Angels and Saints.* pag. 377.

Chap. 4. *Of the Term, Formal Invocation, and the different Forms uſed in the Invocation of Saints. Some Inſtances out of the Fathers, to ſhow the like to have been uſed in their Times.* pag. 397.

Chap. 5. *The diſparity aſſigned by Dr.* St. *between deſiring the Saints in Heaven, and Holy Men upon Earth, to pray for us, ſhown to be Inſignificant.* pag. 414.

Chap. 6. *Of the practice of Chriſtian People in St.* Auſtin's *time, in the Invocation of Saints.* pag. 430.

The Two *Queſtions*, whence Dr. *Still.* took Occaſion to raiſe this *Controverſy.*

1. WHether a *Proteſtant* having the ſame Motives to become a *Catholick*, which one bred and born, and well grounded in the *Catholick Religion*, hath to remain in it, may not equally be ſaved in the profeſſion of it?

2. Whether it be ſufficient to be a *Chriſtian* in the *abſtract*, or in the *whole latitude*; or there be a neceſſity of being a member of ſome diſtinct *Church*, or Congregation of *Chriſtians?*

His Anſwer to the aforeſaid *Queſtions.*

The firſt Queſtion *being ſuppoſed to be put concerning a* Proteſtant *yet containing ſo doth imply*

imply a contradiction, viz. That a Protestant continuing so, should have the same Motives to become a Catholick (taking that term here, only as signifying one of the communion of the Church of Rome) which those have who have been born or bred in that communion. But supposing the meaning of the Question to be this, Whether a Protestant leaving the communion of our Church upon the Motives used by those of the Roman Church, may not be equally saved with those who are bred in it? I answer,

1. That an equal capacity of salvation of those persons being supposed, can be no argument to leave the communion of a Church, wherein salvation of a person may be much more safe, than of either of them. No more, than it is, for a Man to leap from the plain Ground into a Ship, that is in danger of being wrackt, because he may equally hope to be saved with those who are in it. Nay, supposing an equal capacity of Salvation in two several Churches, there can be no reason to forsake the communion of the one for the other. So that to perswade any one to leave our Church to embrace that of Rome, it is by no means sufficient to ask whether such a one may not as well be saved, as they that are in it already: but it is necessary, that they prove, that it is of necessity to salvation to leave our Church, and become a Member of theirs: And when they

do

do this, I intend to be one of their number.

2. *We assert, that all those who are in the communion of the* Church *of* Rome, *do run so great a hazard of their Salvation, that none who have a care of their Souls, ought to embrace it, or continue in it. And that upon these Grounds.*

1. Because they must by the terms of communion with that Church, be guilty either of Hypocrisie or Idolatry, *either of which are sins inconsistent with Salvation; Which I thus prove.*

That Church *which requires the giving the* Creature *the Worship due only to the* Creator, *makes the Members of it guilty of Hypocrisie or Idolatry; for if they do it, they are guilty of the latter, if they do it not, of the former; but the* Church of *Rome* in the Worship of God by Images, the Adoration of the Bread in the Eucharist, and the formal Invocation of Saints, *doth require the giving to the Creature the Worship due only to the Creator; therefore it makes the Members of it guilty of Hypocrisie or Idolatry.*

That the Church *of* Rome *in these particulars doth require the giving the Creature the honour due only to* God; *I prove thus concerning each of them.*

1. *Where the Worſhip of* God *is terminated upon a Creature, there by their own confeſſion, the Worſhip due only to* God *is given to the Creature; but* in the Worſhip of God by Images, *the Worſhip due to God is terminated wholly on the Creature; which is thus proved: The Worſhip which* God *himſelf denies to receive, muſt be terminated on the Creature: but God himſelf in the* ſecond Commandment *not only denies to receive it, but threatens ſeverely to puniſh them that give it. Therefore it cannot be terminated on* God, *but only on the Image.*

2. *The ſame Argument which would make the greſſeſt Heathen Idolatry lawful, cannot excuſe any act from* Idolatry, *but the ſame argument, whereby the* Papiſts *make the Worſhip of the Bread in the* Euchariſt *not to be Idolatry, would make the greſſeſt Heathen* Idolatry *not to be ſo. For, if it be not therefore* Idolatry, *becauſe they ſuppoſe the bread to be* God, *then the Worſhip of the Sun was not* Idolatry *by them who ſuppoſed the Sun to be* God, *and upon this ground, the greſſer the* Idolatry *was, the leſs it was* Idolatry: *for the greſſeſt* Idolaters *were thoſe, who ſuppoſed their Statues to be* Gods. *And upon this ground their Worſhip was more lawful, than of thoſe who ſuppoſed them not to be ſo.*

3. *If the ſuppoſition of a middle excellency between* God *and* us, *be a ſufficient ground for* formal

formal Invocation, *then the Heathen Worſhip of their inferiour* Deities *could be no* Idolatry: *for the Heathens ſtill pretended, that they did not give to them the Worſhip proper to the Supream God; which is as much as is pretended by the devouteſt* Papiſt, *in juſtification of the* Invocation of Saints. *To theſe I expect a direct and punctual anſwer, profeſſing as much Charity towards them, as is conſiſtent with Scripture and Reaſon.*

2. Becauſe the Church of *Rome* is guilty of ſo great corruption of the Chriſtian Religion by ſuch opinions and practiſes which are very apt to hinder a good life: *Such are*, the *deſtroying the neceſſity of a good life*, by making the Sacrament of Penance joyned with contrition, ſufficient for ſalvation; *the taking off the care of it*, by ſuppoſing an expiation of ſin (by the prayers of the living) after death; *and the ſincerity of devotion is much obſtructed in it*, by prayers in a language which many underſtand not; by making the efficacy of Sacraments depend upon the bare adminiſtration, whether our minds be prepared for them or not; by diſcouraging the reading the Scripture, which is our moſt certain rule of faith and life; by the multitude of ſuperſtitious obſervations never uſed in the Primitive Church, as we are ready to defend; by the groſs abuſe of people in Pardons and Indulgences, by denying the Cup to

the Laity, contrary to the practice of the Church in the ſolemn Celebration of the Euchariſt for a thouſand years after Chriſt; by making it in the power of any perſon to diſpenſe contrary to the Law of God, in oaths and Marriages; by making diſobedience to the Church in diſputable matters, more hainous, than diſobedience to the Lawes of Chriſt in unqueſtionable things, as Marriage in a Prieſt, to be a greater crime, than Fornication.

By all which practiſes and opinions we aſſert, that there are ſo many hinderances to a good life, that none who have a care of their ſalvation, can venture their ſouls, in the communion of ſuch a Church, *which either enjoyns or publickly allows them.*

3. Becauſe it expoſeth the faith of Chriſtians to ſo great uncertainty: *By* making the authority of the Scriptures to depend on the infallibility of the Church, when the Churches Infallibility muſt be proved by the Scripture: *by* making thoſe things neceſſary to be believed, which if they be believed, overthrow all foundations of faith, viz. *That we are not to believe our ſenſes in the plaineſt objects of them, as that bread which we ſee is not bread; upon which it follows, that tradition being a continued kind of ſenſation, can be no more certain, than ſenſe it ſelf; and that the Apoſtles might have been deceived in the Body*

of

of Christ *after the Resurrection*; *and the* Church *of any Age in what they saw or heard. By* denying to Men the use of their judgment and reason as to the matters of faith proposed by a Church, *when they must use it in the choice of a* Church; *by* making the Churches power extend to make new Articles of faith, viz. *by making those things necessary to be believed, which were not so before. By* pretending to infallibility in determining Controversies, and yet not determining Controversies which are on foot among themselves. *All which, and several other things which my designed brevity will not permit me to mention; tend very much to shake the faith of such, who have nothing else to rely on, but the authority of the* Church of Rome.

3. *I answer,* That a Protestant leaving the Communion of our Church, doth incur a greater guilt, than one who was bred up in the communion of the Church of *Rome*, and continues therein by invincible ignorance, *and therefore cannot equally be saved with such a one. For a* Protestant *is supposed, to have sufficient convictions of the Errors of the* Roman Church, *or is guilty of wilful ignorance, if he hath not; but although we know not what allowances God will make for invincible ignorance, we are sure that wilful ignorance, or choosing a worse Church before a better, is a damnable sin, and unrepented of destroys salvation.*

To the ſecond Queſtion, *I anſwer*, 1. *I do not underſtand what is meant by a* Chriſtian in the Abſtract, or in the whole Latitude, *it being a thing I never heard or read of before; and therefore may have ſome meaning in it, which I cannot underſtand.* 2. *But if the Queſtion be as the laſt words imply it, Whether a* Chriſtian *by vertue of his being ſo, be bound to joyn in ſome* Church *or* Congregation *of* Chriſtians? *I anſwer affirmatively, and that he is bound to chooſe the communion of the pureſt* Church, *and not to leave that for a corrupt one, though called newer ſo* Catholick.

The

The *Reply* to Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Anſwer.

Madam,

I Did not expect that two bare Queſtions could have produced ſuch a ſuper-fœtation of Controverſies, as the Paper you ſent me is fraught with; But ſince the Anſwerer hath been pleas'd to take this Method, (for what end himſelf beſt knows) I ſhall not refuſe to give a fair and plain return, to the ſeveral Points he inſiſts upon, and that with as much brevity as the matter and circumſtances will bear.

The Queſtions propoſed were: 1. Whether a Proteſtant having the ſame Motives to become a Catholick, which one bred and born, and well grounded in Catholick Religion hath to remain in it, may not equally be ſaved in the profeſſion of it?

The 2*d*. Whether it be ſufficient to be a Chriſtian in the abſtract, or in the whole latitude; or there be a neceſſity of being a Member of ſome diſtinct Church or Congregation of Chriſtians?

The firſt, he ſaith, *being ſuppoſed to be put concerning*

concerning a Protestant continuing so, implyes a contradiction; but where it lyes I cannot see, for a Protestant may have the same Motives, and yet out of wilfulness or passion not acquiesce to them. He saw no doubt this supposition to be impertinent to the Question, and therefore in the second part of the 1. §. states it thus: *Whether a Protestant leaving the Communion of the Protestant Church, upon the Motives used by those of the* Roman *Church, may not be equally saved with those who were bred in it?*

The Question thus stated in its true supposition, he answers first, §. 2. *That an equal capacity of salvation of those persons being supposed, can be no argument to leave the Communion of a Church, wherein the salvation of a person may be much more safe than of either of them.* But before I reply, I must do both him and my self right in matter of fact, and it is, *Madam*, that when you first addressed to me, you professed your self much troubled, that he had told you, a person leaving the Protestant communion, and embracing the Catholick, could not be saved. That we should deny salvation to any out of the Catholick Church, you lookt upon as uncharitable, and this assertion of his had startled you in the opinion you had before of the Protestant Charity. Whereupon you desired to know my opinion in the case, and I told

told you I saw no reason, why the same Motives which secured one born and bred, and well grounded in Catholick Religion, to continue in it, were not sufficient also to secure a Protestant, who convinced by them, should embrace it. This *Madam*, your self can witness, was the true occasion of your proposing the Question, and not as the Answerer supposes, that I used the meer Question it self as a sufficient Argument to perswade you to embrace the Catholick Communion. This premised, I reply, that the Answer he gives, is altogether forrain to the matter in hand, the Controversie not being between a Bred and a Converted Catholick on the one side, and a person supposed to be in a safer Church than either of them on the other: nor yet between two several Churches supposed to have in them an equal Capacity of salvation, but between a person bred in the Catholick Religion on the one side, and another converted to it from Protestantism on the other, whether the latter may not be equally saved with the former? Nor is it to the purpose of the present Question, to prove *that it is of necessity to Salvation to leave the Protestant Church, and become a Member of the Catholick*, because the Question is only of the possibility, not of the necessity of Salvation. I say it is not necessary to the present Question to prove this, but rather belongs to

the

the ſecond,(where I ſhall ſpeak to it.)Whether there be a neceſſity of being a Member of ſome diſtinct Church? Which being reſolved affirmatively by both parts,it follows then in order to enquire which this true Church is. As for the Example of *a Man leaping from the plain ground into a Ship that is in danger of being Wrackt*, meaning by that Ship (as I ſuppoſe he does) the Catholick Church. Some will be apt to think he had come nrerer the Mark, if he had compared the Proteſtant to a Ship, which by often knocking againſt the Rock on which the Catholick Church is built,had ſplit it ſelf into innumerable Sects, and was now in danger of ſinking: his compariſon was grounded only on his own ſuppoſition,but this is grounded on the truth it ſelf of too ſad an experience. But to leave words,and come to the matter. His ſecond Anſwer is, §. 3. that *all thoſe who are in the communion of the Church of* Rome *do run ſo great a hazard of their Salvation, that none who have a care of their Souls ought to embrace or continue in it.* The firſt anſwer as I have ſhewed, was nothing pertinent to the preſent Queſtion, nor comes this ſecond any nearer the matter, for though it be ſuppoſed, that none ought to embrace or continue in the Catholick Church by reaſon of the great hazard, he ſaith, they run of their ſalvation, yet if they do embrace or continue

in

in it, why may they not be equally saved, that is, with equal hazard; but this assertion, however beside the Question, he makes it his main business to prove, First, §. 4. *Because those who embrace or continue in the Catholick Church are guilty either of Hypocrisie or Idolatry, either of which are sins inconsistent with salvation.* And here he must give me leave to return upon him a more palpable contradiction, than that he supposed to have found in the Question, *viz.* to assert only, that those of the Catholick Communion run a great hazard of their Salvation, and yet affirm at the same time that they are guilty either of Hypocrisie or Idolatry, sins inconsistent with Salvation: which reduced into plain terms, is no other, but that they may be saved, though hardly, and yet cannot be saved. But to the Argument, *The Church of* Rome, *by the Worship of God by Images, by the Adoration of Bread in the Eucharist, and the formal Invocation of Saints, doth require the giving to the Creature the Worship due only to the Creator; Therefore it makes the Members of it guilty of Hypocrisie or Idolatry.* The charge is great, but what are the proofs?

Concerning the first he saith, § 5. that *in the Worship of God by Images, the Worship due to God is terminated wholly on the Creature.* And surely this implies another contradiction, that it should be the Worship of God by

by Images, and yet be terminated wholly on the Creature; Nevertheleſs he proves it thus; *The Worſhip which God himſelf denies to receive, muſt be terminated upon the Creature; but God himſelf in the ſecond Commandment, not only denies to receive it, but threatens ſeverely to puniſh them that give it*, that is, that Worſhip him by an Image. *Therefore it cannot be terminated on God, but only on the Image.* To this Argument, which to be juſt to the *Author*, I confeſs I have not ſeen anywhere propoſed in theſe terms, I anſwer, that the firſt Propoſition is built on a great miſtake of the Nature of humane acts; which though they ought to be govern'd by the Law of *God*, yet when they ſwerve from it, ceaſe not to tend to their own proper objects. Gods prohibition of ſuch or ſuch a kind of Worſhip, may make it to be unlawful, but hinders not the act from tending, whither it is intended; and conſequently if it be intended or directed by the underſtanding to God, though after an unlawful manner, it will not fail to be terminated upon God: Thus when a Thief or a Murderer prays to God to give him good ſucceſs in the Theft or Murder he intends, though God denies to hear any ſuch Prayer, yet is the Prayer truly directed to him: and thus when the Jews offered to God in Sacrifice the blind and the lame, though he had forbidden it, yet was the oblation terminated

on

on him, and therefore he reproves them for having *polluted him*, *Mal* 1. 8. and to convince them the more of their evil doings: *Offer it now*, says he, *to thy Governour*, will he be pleased with thee, or accept thy person? Though the Governor deny to accept what is presented to him, yet it is truly offered to him by the Presenter; and so, although God deny to accept such or such Sacrifice, yet it is truly offered to him, though the offering of it after a forbidden manner make it to be sin: Did not God *refuse* to accept the Sacrifice of *Cain*, and yet the Scripture, *Gen.* 4. 3. says expressly, that he brought an offering to the *Lord*? God had not respect to *Cain* nor his offering, but this did not hinder, but that *Cain*'s offering had respect to God, & was terminated on him. In like manner, though God deny such or such a kind of Worship; if it be offered though unlawfully by the Creature, yet is it terminated on him. The Proposition therefore which asserts *that the Worship which God denies must be terminated on the Creature*, I deny as absolutely false, and so will you too, *Madam*, when you shall see the sense of it to be no other, but that a wicked Man cannot Pray to God, or Worship him in an unlawful or forbidden manner, who is therefore a wicked Man because he does so. What follows from hence is, that though God should have forbidden Men to

Worship

Worſhip him by Images, yet it does not follow but the Worſhip ſo given, would be terminated on him. But now to ſpeak to his ſecond Propoſition, in which the main force of this Argument conſiſts.

We utterly deny that God in the ſecond Commandment, forbids himſelf to be Worſhipped by a Crucifix, for example, or ſuch like Sacred Image; for ſuch only are the ſubject of the preſent controverſie. What he forbids there, is to give his Worſhip to Idols: and this is clear from the circumſtances of the Text: Firſt, Becauſe this Commandment, if St. *Auſtin's* Judgment be to be followed, is but a Part or Explication of the firſt, Thou ſhalt have no other Gods before me: Secondly, becauſe the Hebrew word *Peſel*, in Latin *Sculptile*, is uſed in Scripture to ſignifie an Idol: Let them be confounded who adore *Sculptilia*, that is, Idols, ſaith the Pſalmiſt, and ſo the Septuagint tranſlate it in this very place εἴδωλον, an Idol, Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf an Idol; So that it was an artifice of the Proteſtants to make their aſſertion ſeem plauſible, to tranſlate *Image* inſtead of *Idol*; and not a certain kind of Image neither, but any whatſoever. Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf *any* graven Image. Now what is all this to Catholicks, who neither make to themſelves, nor adore Idols, nor yield Sovereign honour or acknowledg-

ment

ment of Deity to any but God? We give indeed a veneration to Images, but the Image of God is not another God beſides him, nor is the Worſhip of it the Worſhip of another God, but of him who is repreſented by it: for St. *Baſil* ſaith, The Worſhip of an Image ſtays not there, but is referred or carried to the prototype, or thing repreſented.

We give therefore an inferior, or relative honour only to the Sacred Images of Chriſt, and his bleſſed Mother, and Saints, not *latriam*, the Worſhip due to God, but *Honorariam adorationem*, a certain honorary Worſhip, expreſſed by kiſſing them, or putting off our Hats, or kneeling before them, much like the Worſhip given to the Chair of State, or the Kings Picture, or his Garment by the like actions: or to come nearer to the ſubject, ſuch as was commanded to be given by *Moſes* and *Joſhua* to the ground whereon they ſtood, by putting off their Shoos, becauſe it was holy: and by the Jews, in adoring the foot-ſtool of God, or falling down before it, *Pſal.* 98. 5. and in Worſhipping (as St. *Jerome* teſtifies they did) that part of the Temple called the Holy of Holies, becauſe there were the Cherubims (ſacred Images ordered by God himſelf to be placed there) the propitiatory (repreſenting Gods Throne) and the Ark (his foot-ſtool). In a word, ſuch as the Proteſtants

Ep. 17. *ad Marcellam.*

themſelves give to the Name of Jeſus when they hear it ſpoken, by putting off their Hats, and bowing at it, or to the Elements of Bread and Wine in the Supper, by kneeling before them, as figures repreſenting the death of Chriſt; if condeſcendence to the conſcience of weaker Brethren, will permit them to own they have any honour or veneration for them, or for the Altar before which they bow. To conclude this point, the *Objector* brings a Text, which forbids us to give the Soveraign honor due to God, to an Idol: but let us hear out of Scripture an expreſs Text that it is not lawful to give to holy Images, and other things relating to God, an inferiour or relative Worſhip, ſuch as we have declared, and that will be to the purpoſe.

§. 6. He aims to conclude the Catholick Church guilty of Idolatry, from the adoration of the *Bread* (as he believes it) in the Euchariſt. Now to do this, he ought to prove, that what we adore in the Euchariſt, is bread indeed. But inſtead of that, he brings a compariſon between *our* adoration of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, and the Heathens adoration of the Sun: *viz. That the Papiſts by the ſame Argument, make the Worſhip of the bread in the Euchariſt not to be Idolatry, which would excuſe the Heathens Worſhip of the Sun and of their Statues from Idolatry; For if it be not therefore Idolatry,* ſays he, *becauſe they ſuppoſe*

the

the bread to be God, then the Worſhip of the Sun was not Idolatry in them, who ſuppoſed the Sun to be God. I ſhall not complain here of the unhandſomneſs of the expreſſion, that Catholicks ſuppoſe the *Bread* to be *God*, juſt as the Heathens ſuppoſed the Sun to be God: whereas he knows, that Catholicks believe, that the ſubſtance of the bread is changed into Chriſts body; but ſhall anſwer to the Argument, That the Worſhip of Chriſt in the Euchariſt is not Idolatry, becauſe we only ſuppoſe him to be really preſent under the form of bread; but becauſe we know and believe this upon the ſame grounds and motives upon which we believe (and thoſe motives ſtronger than any Proteſtant hath (if he have no other than the Catholick, to believe) that Chriſt is God, and conſequently to be adored. And therefore that you may the better ſee the inefficaciouſneſs of the Argument, ſuppoſe it dropt from the Pen of an *Arrian* againſt the adoration of Chriſt as God, and it will be of as much force to evince that to be Idolatry, as it is from the Objector's to prove the adoration of him in the Euchariſt to be ſo. See there how an *Arrian* might argue in the ſame form. The ſame Argument which would make the groſſeſt Heathen Idolatry lawful, cannot excuſe any act from Idolatry: but the ſame Argument, whereby the Proteſtants make the Worſhip

of Chriſt (a pure Man, ſays the *Arrian*) not to be Idolatry, would make the groſſeſt Heathen Idolatry not to be ſo: For if it be not therefore Idolatry, becauſe they ſuppoſe Chriſt to be God, then the Worſhip of the Sun was not Idolatry, by them who ſuppoſed the Sun to be God, *&c.* Now the ſame anſwer which ſolves the *Arrians* argument againſt the adoration of Chriſt as God, ſerves no leſs to ſolve the Objectors Argument againſt the adoration of him in the Euchariſt, ſince we have a like Divine Revelation for his real preſence under the Sacramental Signs, as we have for his being true God and Man.

But what if Catholicks ſhould be miſtaken in their belief? Would it then follow, that they were Idolaters? Dr. *Taylor* an eminent and leading Man amongſt the Proteſtants, denies the conſequence. His words are theſe, in the Liberty of *Prophecying*, Sect. 20. Numb. 26. *Idolatry*, ſays he, *is a forſaking the true God, and giving Divine Worſhip to a Creature, or to an Idol, that is, to an Imaginary God, who hath no foundation in Eſſence or Exiſtence: And this is that kind of ſuperſtition, which by Divines is called the ſuperſtition of an undue object: Now it is evident, that the object of their* (that is, the Catholicks) *adoration* (that which is repreſented to them in their minds, their thoughts and purpoſes and

by

by which God principally, if not ſolely, takes eſtimate of humane actions) in the bleſſed Sacrament, is the only true and Eternal God, hypoſtatically joyned with his Holy Humanity, which Humanity they believe actually preſent under the Veil of the Sacramental Signs; and if they thought him not preſent, they are ſo far from worſhipping the bread in this caſe, that themſelves profeſs it Idolatry to do ſo; which is a demonſtration (mark that) *that their Soul hath nothing in it, that is Idolatrical. If their confidence and fanciful Opinion* (ſo he terms the faith of Catholicks) *hath engaged them upon ſo great a miſtake* (*as without doubt*, he ſays *it hath*) *yet the will hath nothing in it, but what is a great enemy to Idolatry.* Et nihil ardet in inferno niſi propria voluntas; *that is, Nothing burns in Hell, but proper Will.* Thus Dr. *Taylor*; and I think it will be a task worthy the Objectors pains, to ſolve his Argument, if he will not abſolve us from being Idolaters.

§. 7. He proceeds to prove, that Catholicks are guilty of Idolatry, by their Invocation of Saints: And his Argument is this; *If the ſuppoſition of a middle excellency between God and us, be a ſufficient ground for formal Invocation, then the Heathens Worſhip of their inferiour Deities, could be no Idolatry, for the Heathens ſtill pretended that they did not give to them the Worſhip proper to the Su-*

pream God, which is as much as is pretended by the devouteſt Papiſts in juſtification of the Invocation of Saints. To anſwer this Argument, I ſhall need little more than to explicate the hard words in it; which thus I do. By perſons of a middle excellency, we underſtand perſons endowed with ſupernatural gifts of Grace in this life, and Glory in Heaven, whoſe prayers by conſequence are acceptable and available with God: what he means by formal Invocation, I underſtand not well: but what we underſtand by it, is deſiring or praying thoſe juſt perſons to pray for us. The ſupream Deity of the Heathens is known to be *Jupiter*, and their inferiour Deities, *Venus*, *Mars*, *Bacchus*, *Vulcan*, and the like rabble of Devils, as the Scripture calls them, The gods of the Heathens are Devils. The terms thus explicated, 'tis eaſie to ſee the inconſequence of the Argument, that becauſe the Heathens were Idolaters in worſhipping *Mars* and *Venus* their inferiour Deities, or rather Devils, though they pretended not to give them the Worſhip proper to *Jupiter* their Supream God: Therefore the Catholicks, muſt be guilty of Idolatry, in deſiring the ſervants of the true God, to pray for them to him. Upon this account we muſt not deſire the prayer of a juſt Man, even in this life, becauſe this formal Invocation will be to make him an inferiour Deity.

But

But if ſome Sect of Heathens, as the *Platoniſts*, did attain to the knowledge of the true God, yet St. *Paul* ſays, they did not glorifie him as God; but changed his glory into an Image made like to corruptible man, adoring and offering Sacrifice due to God alone, to the Statues themſelves, or the inferiour Deities they ſuppoſed to dwell or aſſiſt in them. Which inferiour Deities St. *Auſtin* upon the Ninety ſixth Pſalm, proves to be Devils or evil Angels, becauſe they required Sacrifice to be offered to them, and would be worſhipped as Gods. Now what compariſon there is between this worſhip of the Heathens inferiour Deities, and Chriſtians worſhip of Saints and Angels, let the ſame St. *Auſtin* declare in his twentieth Book againſt *Fauſtus* the *Manichean*, *chap.* 21. *Fauſtus* there calumniates the Catholicks (the word is St. *Auſtins*) becauſe they honoured the Memories or Shrines of Martyrs, charging them to have turned the Idols into Martyrs, whom they worſhip (ſaid he) with like Vows. The Objection you ſee is not new, that Catholicks make inferiour Deities of their Saints. *Fauſtus* long ago made it, and St. *Auſtin's* anſwer will ſerve as well now as then. *Chriſtian People*, ſays he, *do with Religious Solemnity celebrate the Memory of Martyrs, both to excite to the imitation of them, and to become partakers of their Merits, and be holpen by their*

Prayers, but ſo that we erect Altars, not to any of the Martyrs, but to the God of Martyrs, although in Memory of the ſaid Martyrs; For what Biſhop officiating at the Altar, in the places where their holy Bodies are depoſited: does ſay at any time we offer to thee Peter, *or* Paul, *or* Cyprian? *but what is offered, is offered to God, who crown'd the Martyrs, at the Memories of thoſe whom he crowned, that being put in mind by the very places, a greater affection may be raiſed in us to quicken our love, both to thoſe whom we may imitate, and towards him by whoſe aſſiſtance we can do it. We worſhip therefore the Martyrs with that Worſhip of love and ſociety, with which even in this life alſo Holy Men of God are worſhipped, whoſe heart we judge prepared to ſuffer the like Martyrdom for the truth of the Goſpel. But we worſhip* them *ſo much the more devoutly, becauſe more ſecurely, after they have overcome all the Incertainties of this World; as alſo we praiſe them more confidently now reigning Conquerors, in a more happy life, than whilſt they were fighting in this; but with that Worſhip, which in Greek is called* Latria, *(and cannot be expreſſed by one word in Latin) for as much as it is a certain ſervice properly due to the Divinity, we neither worſhip them, nor teach them to be worſhipped, but God alone. Now whereas the offering of Sacrifice belongs to this Worſhip (of* Latria) *from whence they are called Idolaters, who gave it alſo to Idols, by no means*

means do we ſuffer any ſuch thing, or command it to be offered, to any Martyr, or any holy ſoul, or any Angel: And whoſoever declines into this Error, we reprove him by ſound Doctrine, either that he may be corrected, or avoided.—— And a little after. *It is a much leſs ſin, for a Man to be derided by the Martyrs for drunkenneſs, then even faſting to offer Sacrifice to them. I ſay to ſacrifice to Martyrs, I ſay not to ſacrifice to God in the Memories (or Churches) of the Martyrs, which we do moſt frequently, by that* rite *alone, by which in the manifeſtation of the New Teſtament he hath commanded Sacrifice to be offered to him, which belongs to that Worſhip, which is called* Latria, *and is due only to God.* This was the Doctrine and practice of Chriſtian People in St. *Auguſtine's* time, and that he himſelf held formal Invocations a part of the Worſhip due to Saints, is evident from the Prayer he made to St. *Cyprian* after his Martyrdom. *Adjuvet nos itaque Beatus Cyprianus orationibus ſuis,* &c. *Let Bleſſed* Cyprian *therefore help us* (who are ſtill encompaſſed with this mortal fleſh, and labour as in a dark Cloud) *with his Prayers,* that by Gods grace we may, as far as we are able, imitate his good works. Thus St. *Auſtin*, where you ſee he directs his Prayer to St. *Cyprian*, which I take to be formal invocation; and for a further

Li. 7. de Bapt. cont. Donat. c. 1.

ther confirmation of it, we have the ingenuous confeſſion of *Calvin himſelf*, Inſtit. li. 3. ch. 20. n. 22. where ſpeaking of the third Council of *Carthage*, in which St. *Auſtin* was preſent, he acknowledged it was the cuſtom at that time to ſay, *Sancta Maria, aut Sancte Petre Ora pro nobis*; Holy *Mary*, or Holy *Peter* pray for us.

But now *Madam*, what if after all this, he himſelf ſhall deny, that any of the oppoſite Tenets are Articles of his faith, viz. *That honour is not to be given to the Images of Chriſt and his Saints; that what appears to be bread in the Euchariſt, is not the Body of Chriſt: That it is not lawful to invocate the Saints to pray for us.* Preſs him cloſe, and I believe you ſhall find him deny, that he believes any one of theſe Negative points to be Divine truths; and if ſo, you will eaſily ſee his charge of Idolatry againſt us, to be vain and groundleſs.

Having thus given a direct and punctual anſwer to his argument, I muſt now expect *as much charity from him, as is conſiſtent with Scripture and Reaſon.* How much that is, you will ſee in his third Anſwer to the firſt Queſtion. But to proceed.

§. 8. He brings a Miſcellany of *ſuch Opinions* and *practices* (as he calls them) *which are very apt to hinder a good life, and therefore none who have a care of their Salvation,*

can

can venture their Souls in the communion of ſuch a Church, which either enjoyns, or publickly allows them. He reckons up no leſs than Ten. 1. That we *deſtroy the neceſſity of good life, by making the Sacrament of Penance* (that is, confeſſion and abſolution) *joyned with contrition, ſufficient for ſalvation.* And do not Proteſtants make contrition alone, which is leſs, ſufficient for Salvation? But perhaps the joyning of confeſſion and abſolution with contrition, makes it of a malignant nature: If ſo, certainly when the Book of Common Prayer in the Viſitation of the Sick, enjoyns the ſick Man, if he find his conſcience troubled with any weighty matter, to make a ſpecial confeſſion, and receive abſolution from the Prieſt in the ſame words the Catholick Church uſes, it preſcribes him that as a means to prepare himſelf for a holy death, which in the judgment of the Objector, deſtroys the neceſſity of good life.

2. *Catholicks*, he ſays, *take off the care of good life, by ſuppoſing an expiation of ſin (by the Prayer of the living) after death:* But certainly the belief of temporal pains to be ſuſtained after death, if there be not a perfect expiation of ſin in this life, by works of penance, is rather apt to make a Man careful not to commit the leaſt ſin, than to take off the care of a good life. And though he be aſcertained by faith, that he may be holpen

holpen by the charitable ſuffrages of the faithful living, yet this is no more encouragement to him to ſin, than it would be to a Spendthrift to run into debt, and be caſt into Priſon, becauſe he knows he may be relieved by the charity of his Friends. If he were ſure there were no Priſon for him, that would be an encouragement indeed to play the Spendthrift. And this is the caſe of the Proteſtants in their denyal of Purgatory.

3. *The ſincerity of Devotion*, he ſays, *is much obſtructed by Prayers in a Language which many underſtand not.* If he ſpeak of private Prayers, all Catholicks are taught to ſay them in their Mother Tongue: If of the publick Prayers of the Church, I underſtand not why it may not be done with as much ſincerity of devotion, the People joyning their intention and particular Prayers with the Prieſt, as their Embaſſador to God, as if they underſtood him: I am ſure the effects of a ſincere devotion, for nine hundred years together, which this manner of Worſhip produced in this Nation, were much different from thoſe we have ſeen ſince the reducing of the publick Liturgie into Engliſh, as is manifeſt from thoſe Monuments, which yet remain of Churches, Colledges, Religious Houſes, &c. with their endowments, and in the converſion of many Nations from Heatheniſm to Chriſtianity, effected by the labours

bours and zeal of Engliſh Miſſionaries in thoſe times, *&c.* But this is a matter of Diſcipline, and ſo not to be regulated by the fancies of private Men, but the judgment of the Church; and ſo univerſal hath this practice been both in the Primitive Greek and Latine Churches, and is ſtill (by the confeſſion of the (Pro-eſtant) Authors themſelves of the Bible of many Languages, Printed at *London*, *Anno* 1655.) in moſt of the Sects of Chriſtians, to have not only the Scriptures, but alſo the Liturgies and Rituals in a Tongue unknown, but to the Learned among them: that who will diſpute againſt it, muſt prepare himſelf to hear the cenſure of St. *Auſtin*, *Ep.* 118. where he ſaith, *That it is a point of moſt inſolent madneſs, to diſpute whether that be to be obſerved, which is frequented by the whole Church through the World.*

4. He ſays, *The ſincerity of Devotion is much obſtructed, by making the efficacy of Sacraments depend upon the bare adminiſtration, whether our minds be prepared for them or not.* In what Council this Doctrine was defined, I never read; but as for the Sacrament of Penance, which I ſuppoſe he chiefly aims at, I read in the Council of *Trent*, *Seſſ.* 14. Falſo quidam calumniantur, *That ſome do falſly calumniate Catholick Writers, as if they taught the Sacrament of Penance did confer Grace without the good motion of the receiver, which the*

the Church of God never taught nor thought. But I am rather inclined to look upon this as a miſtake, than a calumny in the Objector.

5. He ſays, *The ſincerity of Devotion is much obſtructed by diſcouraging the reading of Scriptures, which is our moſt certain Rule of Faith and Life.* Here he calls the Churches prudential diſpenſing the reading of Scripture to perſons, whom ſhe judges fit and diſpoſed for it, and not to ſuch whom ſhe judges in a condition to receive, or do harm by it, a diſcouraging the reading of Scriptures; which is no other than whereas St. *Paul, Coloſſ.* 3. 21. enjoyns Fathers not to provoke their Children, leſt they be diſcouraged; one ſhould reprove a Father for diſcouraging his Child, becauſe he will not put a Knife or Sword into his hands, when he foreſees he wil do miſchief with it to himſelf or others; the Scriptures in the hands of a meek and humble Soul, who ſubmits its judgment in the interpretation of it to that of the Church, is a Sword to defend it: but in the hands of an arrogant and preſumptuous Spirit, that hath no Guide to interpret it, but its own fancy or paſſion, it is a dangerous Weapon, with which he will wound both himſelf and others. The firſt that permitted promiſcuous reading of Scripture in our Nation, was King *Henry* the Eighth; and

many

many years were not paſſed, but he found the ill conſequences of it; for in a Book ſet forth by Him, in the Year 1542. he complains in the Preface, *That he found entred into ſome of his Peoples hearts an inclination to ſiniſter underſtanding of it, preſumption, arrogancy, carnal liberty, and contention: which he compares to the ſeven worſe Spirits in the Goſpel, with which the Devil entred into the Houſe that was purged and cleanſed. Whereupon he declarts, that for that part of the Church ordained to be taught, (that is, the Lay People) it ought not to be denyed certainly, that the reading of the Old and New Teſtament is not ſo neceſſary for all thoſe folks, that of duty they ought, and be bound to read it; but as the Prince and Policy of the Realm ſhall think convenient, ſo to be tolerated or taken from it. Conſonant whereunto,* ſaith he, *the Politick Law of our Realm, hath now reſtrained it from a great many.* This was the judgment of him, who firſt took upon him the Title of Head of the Church of *England*; and if that ought not to have been followed in after times, let the dire effects of ſo many new Sects and Fanaticiſms, as have riſen in *England* from the reading of it, bear witneſs. For as St. *Auſtin* ſayes,

Neque enim natæ ſunt Hæreſes; Hereſies have no other Origen but hence, that the Scriptures which Tract. 18. in To.

in

in themſelves are good, are not well underſtood, and what is underſtood amiſs in them, is raſhly and boldly aſſerted, viz. *to be the ſenſe of them.* And now whether the Scriptures left to the private interpretation of every fanciful ſpirit, as it is among Proteſtants, be a moſt certain Rule of Faith and Life, I leave to your ſelf to judge.

6. He ſays, *The ſincerity of Devotion is much obſtructed by the multitude of ſuperſtitious obſervations never uſed in the Primitive Church, as he is ready to defend,* he ſhould have ſaid to prove; for we deny any ſuch to be uſed in the Church.

7. By the groſs abuſe of People in Pardons and Indulgences. Againſt this, I can aſſert as an eye-witneſs, the great devotion cauſed by the wholſome uſe of Indulgences in Catholick Countreys: there being no Indulgence ordinarily granted, but enjoyns him that will avail himſelf of it, to confeſs his ſins, to receive the Sacraments, to pray, faſt, and give alms, all which duties are with great devotion performed by Catholick people, which without the incitement of an Indulgence, had poſſibly been left undone.

8. He ſays, *The ſincerity of Devotion is much obſtructed, by denying the Cup to the Laity, contrary to the practice of the Church in the ſolemn celebration of the Euchariſt for a Thouſand Years after Chriſt.* This thouſand years

years after Christ makes a great noise, as if it were not as much in the power of the Church a thousand years after Christ, as well as in the first or second Century to alter and change things of their own nature indifferent, such as the communicating under one or both kinds, was ever held to be by Catholicks. But although the Cup were not then denyed to the Laity, yet that the custom of receiving but under one kind was permitted, even in the Primitive Church, in private Communions, the Objector seems to grant, because he speaks only of the Administration of it in the solemn Celebration: and that it was also in use in publick Communions, is evident from Examples of that time, both in the Greek Church in the time of St. *Chrysostome*; and of the Latin, in the time of St. *Leo* the great. As for the pretended obstruction of Devotion, you must know Catholicks believe that under either species or kind, whole Christ true God and Man is contained and received; and if it be accounted an hindrance to devotion to receive the total refection of our soul, though but under one kind, what must it be to believe that I receive him under neither, but instead of him have Elements of Bread and Wine? Surely nothing can be more efficacious to stir up

Sozomen. li. 8. Hist. c. 5. & Niceph. li. 13. c. 11. S. Leo Ser. 4. de Quad.

Reverence and Devotion in us, than to believe, that God himself will personally enter under our Roof.

The Ninth *Hinderance of the sincerity of devotion is, that we make it in the power of a person to dispense in Oaths and Marriages contrary to the Law of God.* To this I answer, That some kind of Oaths, the condition of the Person and other Circumstances considered, may be judged to be hurtful, and not fit to be kept, and the dispensation in them is, no more than to judg or determine them to be so: and consequently to do this cannot be a hinderance, but a furtherance to devotion; nor is it contrary to the Law of God which commands nothing that's hurtful to be done. As for Marriages we acknowledge the Church may dispense in some degrees of Consanguinity and Affinity, but in nothing contrary to the Law of God.

His Tenth pretended *Obstruction of Devotion is, that we make disobedience to the Church in Disputable matters, more hainous than disobedience to Christ in unquestionable things, as Marriage,* he saith, *in a Priest to be a greater crime than Fornication.* I answer, That whether a Priest may Marry or no (supposing the Law of the Church forbidding it) is not a disputable matter: but 'tis out of Question, even by the Law of God, that Obedience is to be given to the Commands or Prohibitions

ons of the Church : The Antithesis therefore between disobedience to the Church, in disputable matters, and disobedience to the Laws of Christ in unquestionable things, is not only impertinent to the Marriage of Priests, which is unquestionably forbidden; but supposing the matter to remain disputable after the Churches Prohibition, destroys all obedience to the Church. But if it suppose them only disputable before, then why may not the Church interpose her Judgment and put them out of dispute?

But still it seems strange to them, who either cannot or will not take the Word of Christ, that is, his Counsel of Chastity, *that Marriage in a Priest should be a greater sin than Fornication.* But he considers not, that though Marriage in it self be honourable, yet, if it be prohibited to a certain order of persons, by the Church to whom Christ himself commands us to give obedience, & they oblige themselves by a voluntary vow to live in perpetual chastity, the Law of God commanding us to pay our Vows, it loses its honour in such persons: and if contracted after such vow made, is in the language of the Fathers, no better than Adultery. In the Primitive *Church* it was the custom of some younger Widdows to Dedicate themselves to the Service of the Church, and in order thereunto to take upon them a peculiar habit, and make

a vow of continency for the future. Now in case they married after this, St. *Paul* himself, 1 *Tim.* 1. 12. saith, That they incurred Damnation, because by so doing, they made void their first faith, that is, as the Fathers Expound it, the vow they had made. And the fourth Council of *Carthage*, in which were 214 Bishops, and among them St. *Austin* gives the Reason in these words; *If Wives who commit Adultery are guilty to their Husbands, how much more shall such Widdows as change their Religious State, be noted with the crime of Adultery?* And if this were so in Widdows, much more in Priests, if by Marrying they shall make void their first Faith given to God, when they were consecrated in a more peculiar manner to his Service.

Thus much may suffice for Answer to the Argument, which with its intricate terms may seem to puzzle an unlearned Reader, let us now speak a word to the true state of the Controversy, which is, whether Marriage or single life in a Priest be more apt to obstruct or further devotion. And St. *Paul* himself hath determined the question, 1 *Cor.* 7. 32. where he saith, He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to our Lord, how he may please our Lord; But he that is Married careth for the things that are of the World, how he may please his Wife. This is the difference he putteth between the Married

ried and Single life, that *this* is apt to make us care for the things which belong to God; and *that* to divert our thoughts from him to the things of the World. Judge therefore which of these states is most convenient for Priests, whose proper Office it is to attend wholly to the things of God?

Having thus cleared Catholick Doctrines from being any ways obstructive to good life or devotion, I shall proceed to his third Argument, by which he will still prove that Catholicks run a great hazard of their souls, in adhering to the Communion of the Church of *Rome, Because it expoſeth the Faith of Chriſtians to ſo great uncertainty.* This is a strange charge from the Pen of a Protestant, who hath no other certainty for his faith, but every Man's interpretation of the Letter of the Scriptures. But, First he saith it doth this, *By making the Authority of the Scriptures to depend upon the infallibility of the Church, when the Churches infallibility muſt be proved by the Scriptures.*

To this I Answer that the Authority of the Scripture, not in it self, for so it hath its Authority from God; but in order to us and our belief of it, depends upon the infallibility of the Church. And therefore St. *Auſtin* saith of himself, *That he would not believe the Goſpel, unleſs the Authority of the* *Li. contr. Epiſt. fund.*

Catholick Church did move him. And if you ask him what moved him to ſubmit to that Authority; he tells you, *That beſides the Wiſdom he found in the Tenets of the Church, there were many other things which moſt juſtly held him in it: as the conſent of People and Nations, an Authority begun by Miracles, nouriſhed by Hope, increaſed by Charity, and eſtabliſhed by Antiquity, the ſucceſſion of Prieſts, from the very Seat of St.* Peter, *to whom our Lord commended the feeding of his Sheep, unto the preſent Biſhoprick. Laſtly, The very name of Catholick which this Church alone among ſo many Hereſies hath not without cauſe obtained ſo particularly to her ſelf, that whereas all Hereticks would be called Catholicks, yet if a ſtranger demand where the Catholicks go to Church, none of theſe Hereticks dares to ſhew either his own Houſe or Church. Theſe* (ſaith St. Auſtin) *ſo many and great moſt dear bonds of the name of Chriſtian, do juſtly hold a believing Man in the Catholick Church.* Theſe were the grounds which moved that great Man to ſubmit to her Authority: And when Catholick Authors prove the infallibility of the Church from Scriptures, 'tis an Argument *ad hominem* to convince Proteſtants who will admit nothing but Scripture, and yet when they are convinced quarrel at them as illogical Diſputants, becauſe they prove it from Scripture.

Next

Next he ſaith we overthrow all foundation of Faith, becauſe *We will not believe our ſences in the plaineſt Objects of them.* But what if God have interpoſed his Authority, as he hath done in the caſe of the Euchariſt, where he tells us, that *it is his Body*, muſt we believe our ſences rather than God? or muſt we not believe them in other things, becauſe in the particular caſe of the Euchariſt we muſt believe God, rather than our ſences? Both theſe conſequences you ſee are abſurd: Now for the caſe it ſelf, in which he inſtances, Dr. *Taylor* above cited confeſſes, that they (*viz.* Catholicks) *have a divine Revelation* (*viz.* Chriſt's word, This is my Body) *whoſe Litteral and Grammatical ſence, if that ſence were intended, would warrant them to do violence to all the Sciences, in the Circle*; but, I add, it would be no precedent to them not to believe their ſences in other the plaineſt Objects of them, as in the matter of Tradition, or Chriſts Body after the Reſurrection.

3. He ſaith that *We expoſe Faith to great uncertainty, by denying to Men the uſe of their Judgment and Reaſon as to matters of Faith propoſed by a Church*, that is, we deny particular Mens Judgment, as to matters of faith, to be as good, if not better than the Churches, and to infer from hence, that we make Faith uncertain, is juſt as if on the contrary one ſhould ſay, that Proteſtants make faith

certain by expoſing matter of faith determined by the Church, to be diſcuſſed and reverſed by the Judgment and Reaſon (or rather Fancy) of every private Man. We have good ſtore of this kind of certainty in *England*. But as for the uſe of our Judgment and Reaſon, as to the matters themſelves propoſed by the Church, it is the daily buſineſs of Divines and Preachers, not only to ſhew them not to be repugnant to any natural truth, but alſo to illuſtrate them with Arguments drawn from reaſon. But the uſe, he would have of reaſon, is I ſuppoſe, to believe nothing, but what his *reaſon* can comprehend, and this is not only irrational in its ſelf, but contrary to the Doctrin of St. *Paul*, where he commands us to captivate our underſtandings to the Obedience of Faith.

4. He adds, *We expoſe faith to uncertainty by making the Church power extend to making new Articles of Faith.* And this, if it were true, were ſomething indeed to his purpoſe. But the Church never yet owned any ſuch power, in her General Councils, but only to manifeſt and eſtabliſh the Doctrine received from her Fore-fathers; as is to be ſeen in the prooems of all the Seſſions of the Council of *Trent*, where the Fathers before they declare what is to be believed, ever premiſe that what they declare, is the ſame they have received by Tradition from the Apoſtles. And

becauſe

becauſe it may happen that ſome particular Doctrin was not ſo plainly delivered to each part of the Church, as it happened in St. *Cyprian's* caſe, concerning the non-rebaptization of Hereticks, we acknowledg it is in her power, *to make that neceſſary to be believed which was not ſo before*, not by inventing new Articles, but by declaring more explicitly the Truths contained in Scripture and Tradition.

Laſtly he ſaith, *We expoſe Faith to great uncertainty, becauſe the Church pretending to infallibility, does not determine Controverſies on foot among our ſelves.* As if faith could not be certain, unleſs all Controverſies among particular Men be determined, what then becomes of the certainty of Proteſtants faith, who could yet never find out a ſufficient means to determin any one Controverſie among them? for if that means be plain Scripture, what one Judgeth plain, another Judgeth not ſo, and they acknowledg no Judg between them to decide the Controverſie. As for the Catholick Church, if any Controverſies ariſe concerning the Doctrin delivered (as in St. *Cyprian's* caſe) ſhe determines the controverſy by declaring what is of faith. And for other Controverſies which belong not to faith, ſhe permits, as St. *Paul* ſaith, every one to abound in his own ſence. And thus much in Anſwer to his third Argument, by which, and what hath been ſaid to his former

mer objections, it appears that he hath not at all proved what he asserted in his second Answer to the first Question, viz. *That all those who are in the Communion of the Church of* Rome *do run so great a hazard of their Salvation, that none who have a care of their souls ought to embrace or continue in it.* But he hath a third Answer for us, in case the former fail; and it is,

§. 10. That *a Protestant leaving the Communion of the Protestant Church doth incur a greater guilt, than one who was bred up in the Church of* Rome, *and continues therein by invincible ignorance.* This is the directest Answer he gives to the Question, and what it imports is this, That invincible Ignorance (and *he doth not know what allowance God will make for that neither*) is the only Anchor which a Catholick hath to save himself by. If by discoursing with Protestants, and reading their Books, he be not sufficiently convinced, whereas he ought in the supposition of the Answerer, to be so, that the Letter of the Scripture as interpretable by every private Mans reason, is a most certain Rule of Faith and Life; but is still over-ruled by his own Motives (the same which held St. *Austin* in the bosome of the Catholick Church) he is guilty of wilful Ignorance, and consequently a lost Man; there is no hope of Salvation for him. Much less for a Protestant who shall

embrace

embrace the Catholick Communion, because *he is supposed* (doubtless from the same Rule) *to have sufficient conviction of the Errours of the Roman Church, or is guilty of wilful Ignorance, if he have it not, which is a damnable sin, and unrepented of destroys salvation.* So that now the upshot of the Answer to the Question, Whether a Protestant embracing Catholick Religion upon the same motives, which one bred and well grounded in it, hath to remain in it, may be equally saved with him, comes to this, that they shall both be damned, though unequally, because the converted Catholick more deeply, than he that was bred so. And now who can but lament the sad condition of that great Doctor and Father of the Church, and hitherto reputed St. *Austin*, who rejecting the *Manichees* pretended rule of Scripture, upon the aforesaid grounds, left their Communion to embrace the Communion of the Church of *Rome?* And what is become now of their distinction of points fundamental from not fundamental, which heretofore they thought sufficient to secure both Catholicks and Protestants Salvation, and to charge us with unconscionable uncharitableness in not allowing them to be sharers with us? The absurdness of these consequences may serve for a sufficient conviction of the nullity of his third and last answer to the first Question.

As for what he saith to the second, I agree

so

ſo far with him, that every Chriſtian is bound to chooſe the Communion of the pureſt Church, but which that Church is, muſt be ſeen by the grounds it brings to prove the Doctrines it teaches, to have been delivered by Chriſt and his Apoſtles. That Church is to be judged pureſt which hath the beſt grounds: and conſequently it is of neceſſity to ſalvation to embrace the *communion* of it.

What then you are bound to do in reaſon and conſcience is, to ſee which Religion of the two, hath the ſtrongeſt Motives for it, and to embrace that as you will anſwer the contrary to God and your own ſoul. To help you to do this, and that the Anſwerer may have the leſs exception againſt them, I will give you a Catalogue of Catholick Motives (though not all neither) in the words of the fore-cited Dr. *Taylor*, advertiſing only for brevity ſake, I leave out ſome mention'd by him, and that in theſe I ſet down, you alſo give allowance for ſome expreſſions of his, with which he hath miſ-repreſented them: Thus then he, *Liberty of Proph. Sect.* 20. Speaking of Catholicks, *The beauty and Splendour of their Church, their pompous* (he ſhould have ſaid ſolemn) *Service, the ſtatelineſs and ſolemnity of the Hierarchy, their Name of Catholick, which they ſuppoſe* (he ſhould have ſaid, *their very Adverſaries give them*) *as their own due, and to concern no other Sect of Chriſtians; the*

Antiquity

Antiquity of many of their Doctrines, (he ſhould have ſaid all) the continual ſucceſſion of their Biſhops, their immediate derivation from the Apoſtles; their Title to ſucceed St. Peter, *the flattering (he ſhould have ſaid due) expreſſions of Minor Biſhops (he means in acknowledging the Pope head of the Church) which by being old records, have obtained credibility; the multitude and variety of People which are of their perſwaſion; apparent conſent with Antiquity in many Ceremonials, which other Churches have rejected; and a pretended, and ſometimes (he ſhould have ſaid always) apparent conſent with ſome elder Ages in matters Doctrinal; The great conſent of one part with another in that which moſt of them affirm to be* de fide *(of Faith) The great differences which are commenced among their Adverſaries, abuſing the liberty of Prophecying into a very great licentiouſneſs; Their happineſs of being Inſtruments in converting divers (he ſhould rather have ſaid of all) Nations. The piety and auſterity of their Religious Orders of Men and Women; The ſingle life of their Prieſts and Biſhops, the ſeverity of their Faſts, and their exteriour obſervances, the great reputation of their firſt Biſhops for faith and ſanctity, the known holineſs of ſome of thoſe perſons, whoſe inſtitutes the religious perſons pretend to imitate; the oblique Arts and indirect proceedings of ſome of thoſe who departed from them, and amongſt many o-*

thers

their things the names of Heretick and Schismatick which they with infinite pertinacity (he should have said, upon the same grounds the Fathers did) fasten upon all that disagree from them. These things, saith he, and divers others may very easily perswade persons of much reason, and more piety to retain that which they know to have been the Religion of their Forefathers, which had actually possession and seizure of Mens understandings, before the opposite professions (to wit, of Protestant, Presbyterian, Anabaptist, &c.) had a name.

Thus Dr. *Taylor*, an eminent and leading Man amongst the Protestants; and if *he* confess that these Motives were sufficient for a Catholick to retain his Religion, they must be of like force to perswade a dis-interessed Protestant to embrace it, unless the Protestants can produce Motives for their Religion of greater, or at least equal force, with these, which so great a Man among them confesseth, that Catholicks have for theirs. Here therfore you must call upon the Author of the Paper you sent me to produce a Catalogue of grounds, or at least some one ground for the Protestant Religion of greater or equal force with all these: And as Dr. *Taylor* saith, divers others which he omitted, *viz.* The Scripture interpreted by the consent of Fathers, the determination of General Councils, the known Maxime of Catholicks, that

nothing

nothing is to be believed of Faith, but what was received from their Fore-fathers as handed down from the Apoſtles; The teſtimony of the preſent Church, of no leſs Authority now, than in St. *Auſtin's* time, both for the Letter and the ſence of the Scripture, *&c.* Do this, and the Controverſie will quickly be at an end. Particular diſputes are endleſs, and above the underſtanding of ſuch, as are not learned; but in grounds and principles, 'tis not ſo hard for Reaſon and common ſence to Judge. That you may the better do it in your caſe, I ſhall deſire you to take theſe two Cautions along with you:

Firſt, That the Subject of the preſent Controverſie, are not thoſe Articles in which the Proteſtants agree with us, and for which they may pretend to produce the ſame Motives, we do: But in thoſe in which they diſſent from us, ſuch as are *no Tranſubſtantiation, no Purgatory, no honour due to Images, no Invocation to Saints, and the like*, in which the very Eſſence of Proteſtant, as diſtinct from Catholick, conſiſts. What Motives they can or will produce for theſe. I do not fore-ſee: The pretence of Scriptures being ſufficiently plain, hath no place here, becauſe then the foreſaid Negatives would be neceſſary to be believed as divine Truths. And for their own Reaſon and Learning, it will be found too light when put into the Scale againſt

againſt that of the Catholick Church for ſo many Ages.

The ſecond Caution is, That you be careful to diſtinguiſh between Proteſtants producing grounds for their own Religion, and finding fault with ours. An Atheiſt can cavil and find fault with the grounds which learned Men bring to prove a Deity, ſuch as are the Order of this viſible World, the general conſent of Nations, *&c.* In this an Atheiſt thinks he doth ſomewhat: But can he produce as good or better grounds for his own Opinion? No, you ſee then 'tis one thing to produce grounds for what we hold, and another to find fault with thoſe which are produced by the contrary part. The latter hath made Controverſie ſo long, and the former will make it as ſhort; let the Anſwerer therefore inſtead of finding fault with our Motives produce his own for the Articles in Controverſie, and I am confident you will quickly diſcern which carry the moſt weight, and conſequently which are to be preferred.

A Full Refutation OF Dr. *STILLINGFLEET's* Unjuſt Charge of IDOLATRY Againſt the Church of *Rome*.

The Firſt Part.

Of the Veneration of Holy Images.

CHAP. I.

The Firſt and Second Anſwer to the Firſt Queſtion, ſhewn not pertinent. Neceſſity of Communion with the Church of Rome proved; and his Charge of Idolatry overthrown by his own Principles.

§1. WHoever conſiders how Dr. *Stillingfleet* in his *Anſwer* to the *Two Queſtions*, has engag'd himſelf and his Adverſary in *Seventeen or Eighteen* of the moſt ma-

terial *Controverſies* between *Catholicks* and *Proteſtants*, beſides innumerable others of leſſer concern, which together with the former have ſwell'd his *Rejoynder* to a *ſhort* Paper, into a *large* Book; will not very eaſily free him upon his own word, from being *fond of the practiſe of the Noble Science of Controverſie*, or, as his Friend Dr. *T.* calls it, *The Bleſſed Art of Eternal Wrangling:* eſpecially, if he reflect how eaſie and obvious the *Anſwer* was to the *Queſtions* themſelves, without running into farther Diſputes: To the Firſt, by ſhewing that the *Motives* which are *ſufficient* to ſecure the Salvation of *one* bred up and well-grounded in *Catholick* Religion, are *not* ſufficient to ſecure the ſalvation of *one* bred up in the *Proteſtant*, who convinced by them ſhould embrace the *Catholick*. To the Second, by ſhewing the *Motives* for Communion with the *Proteſtant* Church, to be *greater* and *ſtronger* than *thoſe* for the *Roman*; and therefore *that* to be neceſſarily embraced before *this*; it being agreed between us, that it is of *neceſſity to ſalvation to be a Member of ſome diſtinct Church*. This had been a ready way to put an end to the Diſpute, and give Satisfaction to the Reader; and this had been ſufficient; our Aſſent to the Articles in controverſie, depending upon the ſtrength of the Motives: But to multiply Diſputes without

without cauſe, without end, and without bringing them to Grounds and Principles, as it is no good Argument to prove a man not to be *fond of Controverſie*, ſo all the *Satisfaction* the Reader is likely to gather from it, is a *deſpair* of being ever ſatisfied. When therefore the *Doctor* ſays he *had no other end in this increaſe of Controverſies, but to let his Proteſtant Reader ſee there could be no reaſon to forſake the Communion of that Church*; it is much like, as if a *Mother*, to deter her Son from travelling into other Conntries, ſhould tell him there was a great Sea between, full of Rocks and Pirates, and no Veſſel ſtrong enough to venture over: Beſides, that the Countrey whither he was going ſwarmed with Bears and Lions. This is one way to *let him ſee there could be no reaſon* to think of leaving his Native Countrey; and this is the Method generally purſued by our Adverſaries, for want of ſound Principles, to retain their Adherents in *their* Communion, to make the *dangers* and *difficulties* they are to incounter with in *that* of the *Roman*, ſeem inſuperable, and therefore beſt for them to ſit down contented where they are. But what if all the *dangers* and *difficulties* he raiſes, prove but *Bugbears* and *Scare-Crows?* This I hope by GOD's Grace to make appear in the following Treatiſe.

§ 2. His first Answer to the first Question, was, that *an equal capacity of Salvation of those persons supposed, not onely in order to a safer Church, but in two several Churches supposed equally safe, can be no argument to forsake the Communion of the one for the other.* To this, I reply'd, that the *Answer* was altogether *impertinent* to the *Question*, the *Controversie not being between two persons compared with a third in a safer Church, nor yet between two several Churches supposed to have in them an equal capacity of Salvation, but between a Catholick bred so, and a Protestant converted to be so, whether the later, having the same Motives with the former, may not equally be saved with him?* To what purpose then was it to talk of an *equal capacity supposed in two persons compared with a third in a much safer condition, or in two several Churches compared to one another*; unless it were to make his Reader believe that a supposed *possibility of Salvation* in the Catholick Church, was used by me as a *sufficient Argument* to embrace its Communion? Whereas his own telling the Person concerned, that however Catholicks who were bred so, might be saved, yet a Person leaving the Protestant Communion for the Catholick, could Not be Saved in it, was that which occasion'd the Question. *A weak* but common *Artifice* of the Doctor

and

and his Party, to deter Persons from embracing the Catholick Communion; when yet the more genuine Sons of the Church of *England* are not so cruel as to damn all those who embrace it. The *Answer* then was *nothing* to the *purpose* of the *Question*; and this himself seems to acknowledge, when he adds *Whether it were to the Question or no, he is sure it was very much to the purpose, for which this Controversie was first started.* And then having gotten this loop-hole, he *beseeches* the Person who had proposed the Question, to propose another, and *if not for her own sake, yet for his to insist upon, that he may know one reason at least, why the Believing all the Ancient Creeds, and leading a Good Life, may not be sufficient to salvation, unless one be of the Communion of the Church of Rome. And this,* he says, *he cannot yet procure, though he have often requested it.* Here himself is afraid he may be *thought to digress*; but so earnest a request must not be denied.

§ 3. I remember I promised to speak to this Point when it should be *proper*, (viz. in handling the second Question [*Whether it be necessary to be a Member of some distinct Church?*] where it came in order) and I did so, (though my Adversary takes no notice of it here) as far as was pertinent to the present purpose; when upon his Grant,

that *A Christian by vertue of his being so, is bound to joyn in some Church, and to chuse the Communion of the purest*; I subjoyned, that *that Church was to be judged the purest, which had the strongest Motives for it*: and then laid down a *Catalogue* of such *weighty Motives* for the Roman Catholick, allowed by Dr. *Taylor* *: To which I added, That neither himself in his *Defence*, nor Dr. *Taylor* when he had a mind to invalidate them, produced any thing to weigh against them, but a few *Tinsel-words*, and *one Scripture-Testimony*, interpreted by and according to their own *Fancy*. Having done this, they sing *Io Triumphe*, that [Thou shalt not worship any graven Image] *will out-weigh all the best and fairest Imaginations of the Roman Church*. And now let the Reader judge whether he had any reason to say, that *he could not procure an Answer to this Question, though he had often requested it*.

* *Liberty of Prophesy*, Sect. 20. P. 550.

§ 4. But because he seems so little satisfied with this Answer, as to take no notice of it, I shall now enforce it farther with this Argument *ad hominem*. There was in the World before *Luther*, a distinct Church, whose Communion was *necessary* to Salvation; But this was not the *Protestant*: Therefore it was the *Roman*. The *Major* is evident from his own Concession; that *a Christian, by virtue of his being so, is bound to joyn*

in

in ſome diſtinct Church; which is not poſſible, if there be not ſuch a diſtinct Church to joyn with. The *Minor* alſo, that *this was not the Proteſtant*, is manifeſt, becauſe before *Luther* there was no ſuch Church in the World diſtinct from the *Roman*. It follows therefore (the Queſtion between him and us being of the *neceſſity* of Communion either with the *Roman*, or with the *Proteſtant*) that of the two, the *Roman* Church was, and ſtill is, (as remaining ſtill the ſame) that Church whoſe Communion is neceſſary to Salvation.

§ 5. Again, taking the term *Roman-Church*, not onely for the particular *Dioceſs of Rome*, but for the Churches alſo in Communion with it, as the Head. as we generally take it in this Controverſie; nothing can render her *Communion* not neceſſary to Salvation, but either *Hereſie*, that is, an adheſion to ſome private or ſingular Opinion or *Errour* in *Faith*; or *Schiſm*, that is a *Separation* from former *Eccleſiaſtical Unity*. For the firſt, my Adverſary himſelf (*Rat. Account*, p. 54.) acknowledges (as I ſhall ſhew before I end this Chapter) the Church of *Rome* to believe *all the ſame Articles of Faith with the Proteſtant*, and that the Points in which the *Proteſtant* differs from the *Roman*, are *not Articles of Faith*; conſequently, the Oppoſite Tenets to them, can be no Errours in *Faith*

with him. And for the ſecond, if he will make the Church of *Rome* guilty of *Schiſm*, he muſt aſſign ſome other diſtinct *Church* (then at leaſt in being) from whoſe Unity ſhe departed; which I think was never pretended, I am ſure can never be performed. As for the Charge of *Cauſal Schiſm*, that is, the *Churches* having given juſt cauſe for *Separation* (the common plea of all *Separatiſts*) by *Impoſing*, as is pretended, *New Articles of Faith*, and ſome of them *Idolatrous*; as it implies an acknowledgment of the *Fact* of *Schiſm*, that is, of breaking *Church-Unity*, to be on the *Proteſtants* ſide: ſo till the Accuſation be made good, and judged ſo by ſome other more competent Judge than themſelves, they ſtand arraigned of the *Crime* of *Schiſm* alſo, for breaking Communion with the Church of *Rome*.

§ 6. Laſtly, not to ſpend too much time in a *Digreſſion*, and yet ſatisfie his deſire, (and if not his, the Readers) *why the Believing all the Antient Creeds, and leading a Good Life, may not be ſufficient to Salvation, unleſs one be of the Communion of the Church of Rome*: I argue thus: *A Chriſtian by virtue of his being ſo*, is bound to be of the Communion of *that* Church which *evidently* was the *true* one, and the *pureſt*, until it be *as evidently* at leaſt (if not *more evidently*) proved not to be ſo: for otherwiſe he wrongs both his *Reaſon* and *Conſci-*

Conſcience, if he leave a *greater* evidence, and adhere to a *leſſer*. But the *Roman Church*, as comprehending all thoſe in Communion with her, by the *Teſtimony* not only of *S. Paul* (*Rom.* c. 1. and c. 16.) but of the *whole Chriſtian World of all Ages*, was *evidently* once the *onely true Church of Chriſt*, and conſequently the *Pureſt*; and neither hath nor can be *as evidently*, much leſs *more evidently*, proved not to be ſo ſtill, ſince the Teſtimony of thoſe who do or will deny it, is incomparably ſhort of the former. Therefore a Chriſtian, by virtue of his being ſo, is bound to be of the Communion of the *Roman Church*.

§ 7. Having thus not only given *one* but *more Reaſons* to his *Demand* (which I heartily pray may do him good, becauſe he requeſted ſo earneſtly to know them) I cannot but reflect how ſpeciouſly ſoever it hath been hitherto pretended againſt the Church of *Rome*, that *the believing all the Ancient Creeds, and leading a Good Life, is all that is neceſſary to Salvation*; yet now there is *more* required by him, viz. *to joyn in ſome Church or Congregation of Chriſtians, by virtue of a mans being a Chriſtian, and that he is bound to chuſe the Communion of the Pureſt Church*, by which I will ſuppoſe at preſent he means the *Church* of *England*. I hope I may without offence take the ſame liberty with him, which

which he did with me, and desire, if not for my own sake, at least for the satisfaction of the *Presbyterians*, *Anabaptists*, and other Separated *Congregations*, to know one Reason from him, why the believing all the Ancient Creeds, and leading a Good Life, may not be sufficient to Salvation, unless one be of the Communion of the Church of *England!* I confess I may be mistaken to suppose him to mean by the *purest Church*, the *Church* of *England*: It is not improbable, as will appear in the following Discourse, that he means *that* of the *Presbyterians*; but let him mean which he will, it comes all to the same pass. I leave him to satisfie *all* other Sectaries, why they are bound, by virtue of their Christianity, to joyn in *either* of *those* two Congregations; or if not in *them*, in any other which he fancies to be the *purest*. Which done, I proceed to his Second Answer to the First Question, very fitly called by him the *main business*, because it serves him as a Foundation to raise so many Controversies upon, as by his manner of treating them, may frighten any one that shall but look toward the *Roman* Church, into despair of ever getting out of so intricate a Labyrinth.

§. 4. He

§ 8. His ſecond Anſwer to the Firſt Queſtion, was, That *all thoſe who are in the Communion of the Church of Rome, do run ſo great a hazard of their Salvation, that none who have a care of their Souls, ought to embrace it, or continue in it, becauſe they muſt be guilty either of Hypocriſie or Idolatry, ſins inconſiſtent with Salvation. This*, I ſaid, *was as little pertinent* to the Queſtion, as the former; for, *though it be ſuppoſed that none ought to embrace or continue in the Catholick Church, by reaſon of the great hazard*, he ſaith, *they run of their Salvation; yet if they do embrace it, why may they not be equally ſaved, that is, with equal hazard?* To this he returns, that he is *amazed I ſhould ſay this Anſwer of his was not pertinent to the Queſtion, if the Queſtion were propounded for any ones ſatisfaction, that doubted, which Churches Communion it were beſt to embrace.* And who can chuſe but be *more amazed* at this Reply, which gives no ſatisfaction at all to the *Queſtion?* For the Queſtion, ſuppoſing the ſame Motives, and conſequently an equal capacity, or hazard (as he will have it) of Salvation in two perſons, what anſwer is it to the Queſtion, whether they may not equally be ſaved, though with hazard, to ſay the hazard they run is very great? And yet of 573 pages his Book contains, no leſs than 544 of them are ſpent upon this ſubject. *Tanta molis erat* [illegible]

I added farther, That this Answer of his implied a Contradiction, in asserting, that *all those of the Catholick Communion do run* indeed *a great hazard of their Salvation*, and then affirming for proof of this Assertion, that *they must be guilty of Hypocrisie or Idolatry, sins inconsistent with Salvation*: Which reduced into plain terms, is no other but to say, they may be saved, though with danger, and yet indeed they cannot be saved at all. To salve this Contradiction, he runs to a pretended supposition of *wilful embracing or continuing in Hypocrisie or Idolatry, sins* (if unrepented of) *inconsistent with Salvation*: But this Salve is not at all proper for the Sore, since if the Motives convince the Understanding, and the Persons be sincere, as the Question supposes, there cannot with any shew of Reason be any thing of *wilfulness* supposed in the Case. The Answer then was nothing to the purpose of the Question; but onely that it might serve him for an occasion to bring the *whole Body of Controversie* into the Field, and give a *treble Charge of Idolatry* against the *Church of Rome*, viz. *in worshipping of Images, Adoration of the Host, and Invocation of Saints*. There want not *Learned* and *Eminent* men of the *Church* of *England*, who think the Charge to be over great; and there needs no more than his *own Principles* to make the *Metal* of his Proofs appear of

too

too inferiour an *Alloy* to bear it. Which thus I ſhew.

§ 9. In his *Rational Account of the Grounds of Proteſtant Religion*, pag. 54. he lays down the ſtate of the difference between the *Church* of *Rome* and the *Church* of *England*, in theſe words: *The Church of Rome impoſeth new Articles of Faith to be believed as neceſſary to Salvation.* —— *But the Church of England makes no Articles of Faith but ſuch as have the Teſtimony and Approbation of the whole Chriſtian World of all Ages, and are acknowledged to be ſuch by Rome it ſelf, and in other things* (as that no Veneration is due to Images, the Bread is not Tranſubſtantiated into the Body of Chriſt, Saints are not to be invocated, *&c.*) *ſhe requires ſubſcription to them, not as Articles of Faith, but as inferiour Truths*; or as Dr. *Bramhall*, (Lord Primate of *Ireland*, alledged by him) calls them, *Pious Opinions, fitted for the preſervation of Unity*; *not*, ſays he, *that we oblige any man to believe them, but onely not to oppoſe or contradict them.* This then is the *Baſis* and Foundation he lays of *his Rational Account of the Grounds of the Proteſtant Religion*, that no *Doctrine* of the *Proteſtant* Religion, as it differs from that of the *Roman*, is an *Article* of *Faith*; that is, that no *Proteſtant* believes, or if he do, he ought not to believe, as a matter of Faith, that

that *the Images* (for example) *of Christ and his Saints are not to be honoured, that the substance of the Bread is not changed into the Body of Christ, that the Saints in Heaven are not to be invoked to pray for us:* Nay, all that he is obliged to by the Church of *England*, is *not to oppose* or *contradict* them. This being so, let us now see what follows from this Doctrine.

1. It follows that the Church of *Rome* does not erre against any Article of Faith, because *the Church of England* as he saith, *makes no Articles of Faith, but such as are acknowledged to be such by Rome it self.*

2*dly*, It follows, that himself does not believe any of these Points to be Articles of Faith, *Viz.* That *Veneration is not to be given to Holy Images*, that *Adoration is not to be given to the Eucharist*, or that *the Saints are not to be invocated*; because to be Articles of Faith with him, *they must have the Testimony and Approbation of the whole Christian World of all Ages, and be acknowledged to be such by Rome it self.*

3*dly*, It follows, that after all this bustle to make the *Church* of *Rome* guilty of *Idolatry*, in these very Points of *Veneration of Images*, &c. For ought any Man knows, himself gives *no interiour assent* to any of the forementioned Tenets, not even as to *Inferiour Truths*, or *Pious Opinions*, because *the Church*

of

of England, as he cites out of Dr. *Bramhall*, *doth not oblige any Man to believe them, but only not to oppose or contradict them*; and it is not likely he defers more to the *Church* of *England*, than she obliges him too.

4*thly*, and lastly, It follows, that his charge of Idolatry against the *Church* of *Rome* is vain and groundless, for *Idolatry* being an *Error* against the most Fundamental *Point* of *Faith*, and the Church of *Rome* according to him, not erring against *any* Article of Faith, 'tis evident, that to charge the *Church* of *Rome* with *Idolatry*, must according to *his own Principles* be the most groundless, unreasonable, and contradictory proceeding in the World. But it is time now to come to particulars; onely I must not omit to desire every indifferent Reader to reflect, and judge whether Dr. *Stillingfleet*, to render the Doctrine of the 39. Articles, digestible to the most squeamish stomack of the nicest Nonconformist, have not done a notable piece of service to the Church of *England* in degrading so many of them as are *not acknowledged* by the *Church* of *Rome* (although they be esteemed the distinctive badg of the purity of the Church of *England*) from the dignity of being *Articles* of *Faith*, into a lower Classe of *Inferiour Truths*, as he calls them, which neither himself nor any Body else know, whether they have a grain of truth in them,

them, or no; and consequently are not bound to believe them? Nay, does he not undermine the *Church* of *England* both in her *Doctrine* and *Government*? In her *Doctrine*, by freeing her Subjects from any obligation of *interiour believing* her Articles (in which she differs from the Church of *Rome*) to be so much as *Inferiour Truths*; In her *Government*, by exposing her Ordination to be invaded without scruple, by such as in their hearts judg it *Anti-Christian*, when he tells them, her *Sense* is to oblige them no farther, than not to *oppose* or *contradict* it? Was it not worth the while to rend asunder the Peace of Christendom for a Company of *Opinions*, which (though Dr. *Bramhall* call them *Pious*) yet the *greater* part of *Christians* both in the *East* and *West* for many Ages have, and do condemn for *Impious* and *Blasphemous*? Is not this a very *Rational*, or rather (as Mr. *J. S.* expounds the word) a very *Reasonable* Account of the *Grounds* of *Protestant Religion*; and a rare way of justifying her from the Guilt of Schism? Sure he never thought of charging the Church of *Rome* with Idolatry, when he laid such sandy Principles for his Foundation: *Principles* of so *brittle* a *temper*, that it was not possible they should *bear* so great a *Charge*, without breaking and *discharging* upon himself.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Dr. St.'s chief Argument to prove the Church of Rome *guilty of Idolatry, examined, and his Prepoſterous ways of arguing laid open.*

§. 1. IT is a known ſaying of St. *Irenæus*, and St. *Hierom*, (*Ep. ad Cteſiphont.*) ſpeaking of thoſe, who ſet up their own fancies, in oppoſition to the Doctrine of the Church, that *to lay open what they hold, is to refute it*; and certainly it was never more true, than in the ſubject of the preſent Debate concerning the *Veneration* of *Images*, the very *light* of *nature* teaching, that the *honour* or *diſhonour*, done to a *Picture* or *Image* reflects upon the *Perſon* repreſented by it. This *Proteſtants* themſelves confeſs in civil matters, as in the *Picture* or *Image* of the *King* in order to his *Perſon*; and did *they not corrupt themſelves, in thoſe things which they know naturally*, they could not but acknowledg the ſame in the Image of *Chriſt*, and his *Saints*, in order to *them*. For, is it an honour to the *King*, to kiſs his Picture? and, is it not the like to *Chriſt*, to put off our Hats, or kneel before *Him*? Was it a diſhonour to the *King*, to ſhoot his Picture with Bullets, as the

Souldiers did in the late times, as they march'd along the Streets? And was it *none* to *Christ*, to have his *Image* bor'd through with hot Irons, as he was represented *rising* from the Grave upon *Cheapside Cross*? A Man would think there needed no more but the *light* of *Nature* and *Common sence* to decide this Controversie; and yet the Doctor will needs sustain, that the *honour* given to the *Images* of *Christ* and his *Saints*, does not redound at all to *them*; but is so far from that, that it is no other than down-right *Idolatry*.

§. 2. How vain and groundless (to say no more) this Assertion of his is, I have already shewed in the foregoing Chapter, which may serve for a full and just Refutation of all he brings to justifie his Charge of *Idolatry*, not onely in this matter of *Veneration* of *Images*, but also of the *Adoration* of *the B. Sacrament*, and *Invocation of Saints*: In regard none of the contrary *Tenets* are with him *Articles* of Faith; nay he professes himself not obliged to give any interiour Assent to them so much as to *inferiour Truths*, or *Pious Opinions*. But lest he should take this Compendious way of Refuting, by bringing things to *Grounds* and *Principles*, for *none at all*, (as his *very-well-assured* Friend Dr. *Tillotson* does with my *demonstrating* Friend, as he calls him,

him, Mr. *F. S.* after two Books ſet forth by him in anſwer to his *Rule of Faith*, viz. his *Letter of Thanks*, and *Faith vindicated*) to remove, I ſay, the very Temptation of any ſuch-like vapouring pretence from my Adverſary, I ſhall take the pains to examine and anſwer (with as much brevity as his prolixity will permit) the particular Arguments with which he endeavours to underprop his *tottering* becauſe *groundleſs* Charge of *Idolatry*.

§. 3. In order hereunto, I ſhall firſt ſet down what it is that the Catholick Church teaches concerning the Veneration of Images, and thus it ſtands recorded in the laſt General Council at *Trent*, (*Conc. Trident.* Seſſ. 25.) viz. *That the Images of Chriſt, and of the Bleſſed Virgin Mother of God, and of other Saints, are to be kept and reſerved eſpecially in Churches, and due Honour and Veneration to be given to them; not for that any Divinity or Virtue is believed to be in them, or that any thing is to be asked of them, or any confidence to be placed in them, as was anciently done by the Heathens, who put their truſt in Idols, but becauſe the honour which is exhibited to the Images, is referr'd to the Prototype, or thing repreſented by them: So that by the Images which we kiſs, and before which we kneel, or put off our Hats, we adore Chriſt, and reverence his*

Saints, whom the said Images represent. This is what the Council teaches, and the import of it is, that we may lawfully (and therefore ought upon occasion) to put off our Hats, or kneel before the *Images* of *Christ* and his *Saints*, with intent thereby to *adore* him, and *reverence* them; and this is what the *Council* calls (most conformably to the Light of Nature and Rel gion) the giving of *due Honour and Veneration to Images*, but Dr. *Still.* (most repugnantly to both) *Idolatry.*

§. 4 To maintain this Charge, he lays down a Proposition, which I said imply'd a Contradiction, viz. that *in the worship of God by Images, the worship due to God is terminated wholly on the Creature.* For what greater Contradiction, than that it should *be* the *worship of God*, and yet be terminated *wholly* on the *Creature?* What he brings in his Excuse (p. 57.) is a pretence that God hath forbidden it under the *Notion* of *Idolatry*, and that *the Worship which God calls by the name of Idolatry*, and *its being terminated wholly on the Creature*, are but the same thing in other words. And what is this in effect, but to tell us first, that it is *Idolatry*, because it is *wholly terminated on the Creature*; and then again, that it is *wholly terminated on the Creature*, because it is *Idolatry?* A very proper defence for such a Cause! And from hence

Dr.

Dr. *Tillotſon* may note that the uſe of *Identical Propoſitions* is not ſo *deſpicable* and *ridiculous* as he would make it; but rather the moſt expedite way for Dr. *St.* to reconcile the Terms of the greateſt Contradiction. But to the matter it ſelf I ſhall ſpeak more anon. Let us now ſee how he proves this main Propoſition, [viz. *In the worſhip of God by Images, the worſhip due to God, is terminated wholly on the Creature.*] *The worſhip*, ſaith he, (p. 4.) *which God himſelf denies to receive, muſt be terminated on the Creature: But God himſelf in the ſecond Commandment, not onely denies to receive it, but threatens ſeverely to puniſh them that give it: Therefore it cannot be terminated on God, but onely on the Image.*

§. 5. This is the *terrible Argument*, by virtue of which he paſſes the Sentence of Eternal Damnation upon *all thoſe who are of the Communion of the Church of Rome*, if they repent not of their *adoring Chriſt by putting off their hats, or kneeling before his Image.* And that the Reader may ſee with what *Fruitice* and *Charity* he does it, before I proceed to examine particulars, I ſhall *convene* his own *Conſcience*, to declare to the World, what *kind* of Argument he judges *this* to be. If onely *Topical*, or *Probable*, what anſwer will he give to the Great *Judge* at the dreadful day of Judgment, for *poſitively* condemning

his *Spouſe* the *Church* for an *Adultereſs*, upon an account which *himſelf* acknowledges to be *inevident* and *uncertain?* I believe, himſelf would condemn that perſon for *unjuſt* and *uncharitable*, who ſhould *poſitively* charge the meaneſt mans Wife of *Adultery* upon the like account. If he judge it a *Demonſtration*, (which I cannot eaſily believe, he ſeems to have taken ſuch a *Pique* againſt the *Demonſtrating Way*) then the *Premiſſes* muſt be *evidently* and *certainly true*, and the *Concluſion* in virtue of them, *Impoſſible to be falſe*; and conſequently he muſt have *greater certainty* that the *Church* of *Rome* is *Idolatrous*, than he hath (if he be of the ſame mind with his Friend Dr. *Tillotſon*) of the *Scripture's being the Word of God*, or of the *Sence of any Text of it*, for example, that *Chriſt is God*; for the ſaid *Doctor* lays this down for his *Fundamental Poſition* in his *Rule of Faith*, p. 118. (and affirms it expreſly of the Books of Scripture, in the Preface to his Sermons) that *we are not infallibly certain either that any Book is ſo ancient as it pretends to be, or that it was written by him whoſe name it bears, or that this is the ſence of ſuch and ſuch paſſages in it: It is poſſible all this may be otherwiſe.* From whence I infer yet farther, that if we are *not ſure of the Sence of any Text of Scripture, but poſſibly it may be falſe, Himſelf is not ſure that God hath forbidden the worſhipping himſelf by Ima-*

Images in the second Commandment, and therefore cannot judge his own *Argument* to be a *Demonstration*, nor consequently *evidence* sufficient to make out his Charge of Idolatry. But to come now to particulars.

§. 5. *The worship*, saith he, *which God himself denies to receive, must be terminated on the Creature*, and that *wholly* and *onely on the Creature*, as he expresses it in the Context of his Discourse. This is the *Major* Proposition of his *Syllogism*, and if this fail, the Charge he builds upon it, must needs fall. I asserted it in my *Reply*, to be *absolutely false*, as built ‘upon a mistake of the nature of humane ‘Acts, which though they ought to be go‘vern'd by the Law of God, yet when they ‘swerve from it, cease not to tend to their ‘own proper Objects, and that Gods prohi‘bition of such or such a kind of worship, ‘may make it to be unlawful, but hinders ‘not the Act from tending whither it is in‘tended. Of this I gave instances in the ‘Prayers which Thieves and Murderers make ‘to God for good success; the Jew's offer‘ing to God the Blind and the Lame, which ‘he had forbidden, *Cain's* bringing a Sacri‘fice to the Lord, *Gen.* 4. 3. which he refu‘sed to accept. All which I shewed were ‘notwithstanding terminated on God; and ‘from thence infer'd, that though God (as ‘he

'he falſely ſuppoſes) ſhould have forbidden
'men to worſhip him by Images, yet it does
'not follow, but the worſhip ſo given would
'be terminated on him.

§. 7. To ſhew the *inſufficiency* (as he calls it) of this Anſwer, he aſſerts, that *where God hath prohibited any particular way or means of giving Worſhip to himſelf, that Worſhip ſo given cannot be ſaid to be terminated on him.* And to ſhew the Vanity and Impertinency of this Defence, I anſwer, That this very Aſſertion of his, quite changes the ſtate of the Queſtion, for his Charge being of real Idolatry, and that antecedently to any Prohibition, as appears by his contending that the Church of *Rome* doth *require the giving the Creature the honour due onely to God*, p.3. and by his aſſerting, p.62. that *any Image being made ſo far the Object of Divine Worſhip, that men do bow down before it, doth thereby become an Idol, and on that account is forbidden in the ſecond Commandment:* he now changes his Peremptory [*cannot be terminated on God*] into that Dwindling Expreſſion of [*It cannot* be ſaid *to be terminated on God*] giving his Reader to underſtand, that his meaning now is not, that Catholicks are *really* Idolaters, that is, by the very nature of Worſhip ſo given by an Image antecedently to any Law forbidding it; but *denominatively*, and *in nam*

onely *t*

onely: and that upon account of a Law (ſuppos'd by him moſt falſely, as I ſhall make manifeſt in the following Diſcourſe) to prohibit the giving Worſhip to *God* by bowing or kneeling before an *Image*. And leſt we ſhould any way doubt that this was his meaning, himſelf in the contents of his Firſt Chapter, puts down the ſtate of the Controverſie between us, in theſe words: *The main Queſtion*, ſaith he, *is, Whether God hath forbidden the worſhipping of himſelf by an Image, under the notion* or (as he explicates it, pag. 57.) *under the name of Idolatry?* It were worth the while to ſee the Doctor reconcile the *ſtate* of the *Queſtion* put by *himſelf*, with that *Aſſertion* of his above-cited, pag. 62. that *any Image being made ſo far the Object of Divine Worſhip, that men do bow down before it, doth thereby become an Idol, and on that account is forbidden in the ſecond Commandment*. The *former* ſuppoſes it to have the *notion* or *name* of Idolatry, upon the account of its being forbidden: The *later* affirms it to be forbidden upon the account of its being Idolatry in the very nature of the thing, antecedently to any Prohibition. And in which ſence ſoever of the two, he take the Propoſition in debate, viz. [*The Worſhip which God denies to receive, cannot be terminated on him, but on the Image*] it is evident he contradicts himſelf; For if he mean that it

can-

cannot be terminated on God, *antecedently to the Prohibition*, becauſe *any Image being made ſo far the Object of Divine Worſhip, that men do bow down before it, doth thereby become an Idol, and on that account is forbidden in the ſecond Commandment*, he muſt deny that it is the *Prohibition* which makes it to be *terminated* on the *Image*. And if he mean that it *cannot* be terminated on God, becauſe it is *prohibited* by him to Worſhip Him by an Image, he muſt *deny* what he aſſerted before, that *any Image being made ſo far the Object of Divine Worſhip, that men do bow down before it, doth* THEREBY *become an Idol, and* ON THAT ACCOUNT *is forbidden in the ſecond Commandment*. Let him extricate himſelf as well as he can out of this Labyrinth. I return to what he addes in defence of his Aſſertion, viz. *The Worſhip which God himſelf denies to receive, muſt be terminated on the Creature.*

§. 8. To vindicate this Aſſertion from the Note of Falſhood I had fix'd upon it, he lays down theſe three Propoſitions: 1. *That Worſhip is nothing elſe but an external ſignification of Honour and Reſpect.* 2. That *the ſignification of Honour which is due to God, is not to be meaſured by the Intentions of Men, againſt the declared Will of God.* 3. *The Divine Law being the Rule of Worſhip all prohibited*

bited ways of Worſhip muſt receive that denomination which God himſelf gives them: As, ſays he, *it would be Treaſon, after the Princes Declaration of it by his Laws, for any man to bow down to a Sign-Poſt with the Princes Head upon it. And therefore if God have declared the Worſhip of himſelf by an Image to be Idolatry, it cannot be terminated on God, but onely on the Image.* This is the ſubſtance of his Defence, and what it amounts to, is this, That if God have forbidden, under the *name* of *Idolatry*, to bow down before any Image, though with intention to Worſhip Him by it, this *Act* of *Worſhip* muſt be *called* Idolatry, becauſe not mens Intentions, but the Will of God is the Rule of Worſhip. A rare Defence indeed! But nothing at all to the purpoſe, (although we ſhould yield the Suppoſition to be as true as it is falſe, viz. that God had forbidden it under that name) unleſs he can ſhew that words can never be taken *Metaphorically*, but that the very *definition* of a thing muſt always neceſſarily go along with its *name*. What he charges upon *us*, is the very *definition of Idolatry*, viz. That *we give to the Creature the honour due onely to God*. What he brings to prove it, is a ſuppoſed *extrinſecal denomination*, that if God have *called* the Worſhipping him by an Image *Idolatry*, it muſt receive the *name* of *Idolatry*, and therefore be terminated on the Image.

Image. And if this kind of arguing be good, he may prove by the ſame Logick, that a man worſhipping a falſe God, violates his Neighbours Bed, becauſe God himſelf calls the Worſhipping a falſe God by the name of *Adultery:* And that he that wears a Sword with intention to *defend* his Prince, hath a real intention againſt his Life, in caſe the Prince upon ſome occaſion have forbidden to wear a Sword under the name of *Treaſon.* He that has but look'd over *Ariſtotles* Threſhold, knows, that from the *definition* to the *name,* the conſequence is good, becauſe the *Name* is but a *Note* of the *Nature* or Eſſence of the Thing defined. But nothing more inconſequent than to argue from the *Name* to the *Definition,* becauſe the *Name* may be given upon the ſcore of ſome ſimilitude, either intrinſecal or extrinſecal, and not upon the account of the *Nature* or Eſſence, which is properly ſignified by ſuch a *Name.* The Doctor therefore (to give him his due) in the beginning of his Charge, argues like a *good Logician,* when he would conclude the *Church* of *Rome* guilty of *Idolatry, becauſe* (he ſays) *ſhe requires the giving to the Creature the Honour due onely to God.* But he plays the *downright Sophiſter* in the cloſe, when he would prove that in worſhipping God by an Image, ſhe gives to the Image the Honour due onely to Him; becauſe if God have given it the

name

name of Idolatry, it must receive the denomination of *Idolatry*. Either he must make it out, that a meer *Extrinsecal Denomination* has the miraculous power to reflect against Nature, the Honour directed to God, from Him to the Image; or he must confess that Gods Prohibition of such Worship (if there were any) may make it indeed to be *unlawful*, but hinders not the Act from tending whither it was intended: and consequently if it be intended or directed by the Understanding and Will, to God, though after an *unlawful* manner, it will not fail to be terminated *on God*. Nor is this to make the *Intentions of men to be the Rule of Divine Worship*, for if God have forbidden himself to be Worshipped after such a manner, the giving him such Worship will be a *dishonouring of Him*, though the Giver intend it never so much for his honour. Disobedience it will be, or some other sin, and *denominatively* Idolatry (if forbidden under that *name*) but not a *terminating* the honour due to God upon the Image, unless the Doctor think it a good Argument to prove the *Fields* and *Trees* to be *Merry Companions*, because the Prophet says, *The Fields are joyful, and the Trees of the Wood rejoyce*. These he will say are *Metaphorical* denominations; and so must *that* of *Idolatry* be, in his supposed Prohibition, unless he can prove the Worship due

due to God, to be terminated wholly on the Image, and so the Act it self to have in it the true nature of Idolatry, *antecedently* to such a *denomination.*

§. 9. As for that *Courtly* Comparison of his, that *it would be Treason in any man to bow down to a Sign-Post with the Princes Head upon it,* though with an intention to honour him by it; (a most *self-denying Ordinance* I confess, and not unlike to that *rare example of Self-denyal* to which himself so Religiously exhorts the *Prelates* of *the Church* of *England* in the *Preface* to his *Irenicum*, viz. *to reduce the form of Church-Government to its Primitive State and Order, by retrenching all Exorbitancies* (as he calls them) *of Power, and restoring Presbyteries*) as the World is like to want such an unheard-of Example of *Self-abnegation,* at least till Princes can be perswaded that the *honour* or *dishonour* done to their *Pictures* reflects *not* upon *Them*; and that Act of the *Civil Law* be repealed, (*L. unica. cod. de his qui ad Statuas*) which declares it *Treason* for any man to *deface* his *Princes Picture*; So, *were* it enacted, it would not hinder the Act of Reverence and Respect from being *terminated* upon the Prince to whom it was intended.

§. 10. To

§. 10. To the *Inſtances* I gave in my *Reply*, of *the Prayers which Thieves and Murderers make to God for good ſucceſs, of the Jews offering to God the Blind and Lame, which he had forbidden, and of Cain's offering a Sacrifice to God, which he refuſed to accept*; all which evidently ſhew that God's having forbidden ſuch a kind of Worſhip, hinders it not from being terminated on him: All that he anſwers, is, That theſe *Inſtances do not ſuppoſe any prohibited Object, or Means of Worſhip*, as he ſuppoſeth the *Worſhip of God by an Image* doth. And here again he falls into the ſame Contradiction as before, viz. that it is the Worſhip of *God* by an Image, and yet the *Image* is made the *whole* and *ſole* object of *Worſhip*. But to conclude this point: 'Tis evident, that the Image is not made the Object of Worſhip by the Intention of him that gives it; *which* (ſays Dr. *Taylor*) *is that by which God principally, if not ſolely takes eſtimate of humane actions*) for what he intends, is, to Worſhip *God* by it; and the Intention not making it the Object of Worſhip, an Extrinſecal Denomination from a Law forbidding, (if there were any ſuch) cannot make it to *be ſo*, nor hinder the Act from being terminated on *God*, its intended Object. 'Tis manifeſt then, that the *Major Propſition* of the Argument brought by him to prove the

the *Church* of *Rome* guilty of *Idolatry*, viz. That *the Worſhip which God denies to receive, muſt be terminated on the Creature*, is abſolutely *falſe*; and conſequently all that he builds upon it, falls to the ground. But this was but a *Prelude* to uſher in his *Minor*, viz. That *God not onely denies to receive Worſhip by an Image, but threatens ſeverely to puniſh them that give it.* Upon this it is he lays the main ſtreſs of his Charge of Idolatry; how inconſequently (though ſuppoſed to be as he would have it, a *Prohibition*) I have ſhewed already, and ſhall make yet more apparent, by laying open the *nullity* of the *Proofs* he brings to maintain it.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

The mystery of making the same Proposition sometimes an Article of Faith, and sometimes none. No expres Text against Worshipping God by an Image. His first Proof from the Terms of the Law, manifestly groundless. The Argument from St. Austin's *Judgment, and the Septuagints translating the word* Pesel, *Idol, and not Image, re-inforced.*

1. WHat we are to consider in the first place here, is, what it is that Dr. *St.* will undertake to prove; and it is this, That *God in the second Commandment* (according to his reckoning) *expresly prohibited the giving any Worship to himself by an Image.* This is what upon his Second Thoughts (for the term *expresly* was not in his FIRST Answer) he undertakes to prove: And I cannot but wonder to see it drop now from *his* Pen, who on the one side asserts *Scripture* (doubtless *expres* Scripture) *to be his most certain Rule of Faith*; and on the other side, *denies* (as I shewed above, Chap. 1.) any thing to be an *Article of Faith, which is not acknow-*

ledged to be such by Rome it self. What may the meaning of this be? If it be *expressly* revealed in *Scripture* that *God* is *not* to be worshipped by an *Image*, it *is* an *Article of Faith*. If it be *not acknowledged to be such by Rome it self*, it is *no Article of Faith*, but (as he calls it) an *Inferiour Truth* or *Pious Opinion*, yet such as neither himself nor any man else is bound to believe there is a jot of Truth in it. *Is* it then, or is it *not* an *Article* of *Faith* that *God is not to be worshipped by an Image?* If it be an *Article* of *Faith*, 'tis false what he asserts so stiffly in his *Rational Account*, p. 54. that the *Church of England makes no Articles of Faith but what are acknowledged to be such by Rome it self.* If it be not an Article of Faith, 'tis false what he affirms so positively here, that God hath *expressly prohibited it in the second Commandment.* Which side soever he takes, 'tis manifest he contradicts himself.

2. But perhaps his meaning is, that *what* at one time is but an *Inferiour Truth*, must at another be an *Article* of *Faith*, according as it may serve to the different ends and purposes he has designed to himself. And here if I mistake not, lies the *Knack*, or (if you will give it so venerable a name) the *Mystery* of the business. When the *Hedge* of the Church of *England* (viz. Subscription to her 39 Articles) must be broken down for the

the good Brethren the *Nonconformists* to enter in, and ravage without ſcruple her *Rights* and *Revenues*, ſo many of the ſaid Articles as are not owned by *Rome* it ſelf, muſt be a company of *Inferiour Truths*, or *Pious Opinions*, *not* to be *aſſented to*, but *not* to be *oppoſed* for Unity's ſake. But when the Church of *Rome* is to be charged with Idolatry, (the Pretence *with which Ignorant Preachers*, ſays Mr. *Thorndike*, (Juſt Weights, *p.* 128.) *drive their Factions*) then they are no more *Inferiour Truths*, but *Articles* of *Faith*, *expreſly* revealed in the Holy Scriptures. Now, would an Impartial Reader (to uſe Dr. *Taylor*'s expreſſion upon another occaſion) ſay upon *his conſcience*, *that this was not kindly done*, to make uſe of the Authority of the Church of *Rome* to *unhallow* ſo many of the 39 Articles as are not owned by her, and caſt them down into the Claſs of *Inferiour Truths*, to ſtitch up the *Rent* made by the *Nonconformiſts* from the *Church* of *England*; And then to *conſecrate* them again ſo eaſily by virtue of this one definitive word [*Expreſly*] into *Divine Revelations*, againſt the *Church of Rome*, to make the Breach of the *Church* of *England* from her yet *wider*. But what cannot an *Irenical Compliance* with one Party, and a *Polemical Animoſity*, or (as Mr. *Thorndike* calls it) *Faction* with another do? When the *ſame* Propoſition as it re-

ſpects the *former*, ſhall be rank'd only amongſt *Inferiour Truths*, which *none* are obliged to *aſſent* to; and as it *oppugns* the *latter*, ſhall be *raiſed* to an *Article* of *Faith*, which *all* are bound to *believe*? Here then lies the Myſtery, that the *ſame* Propoſition, viz. That *God is not to be worſhipped by an Image*, taken *Irenically*, and in its *Pacifick* Temper, is but an Inferiour Truth, becauſe not owned to be an Article of Faith by the Church of *Rome*; but taken *Polemically*, and in its *Warlike* Humour, it muſt be an Article of Faith, becauſe *expreſly* (as he ſays) revealed in Scripture. And if he will have it ſo, let us ſee how he goes about to prove it.

3. *Our Controverſie*, ſays he, p. 58. *being now about the ſence of a Law, the beſt ways we have to find the meaning of it, are either from the Terms in which it is expreſſed, or from the Reaſon annexed to it, or from the Judgment of Thoſe whom we believe beſt able to underſtand and interpret it.* And he will *prove* from every one of theſe *three ways*, that it is *expreſly* prohibited in the *ſecond Commandment* to worſhip *God* by an *Image*. It were well, he would tell us here firſt, what he underſtands by the term *Expreſly*. For if he calls *that*, for example, an *expreſs* Text, which *of it ſelf* is *abſolutely clear* and *manifeſt*, and therefore as St. *Auſtin* ſays, (*de unit. Eccl.* c. 19.)

c.19.) *Non eget Interprete, needs no Interpreter*; Mr. *Thorndike* (and those other Learned Men of the *Church* of *England*, who see no better than he) have reason to lament the loss of their Eye-sight. But if he mean no more, but that it is *clear* and *manifest to himself*, they may hope they see as well as their Neighbours, though they see the quite contrary; unless *They* will suffer themselves to be wrought upon by his stout asserting it to be *clear* and *manifest*; as the *Travellers* were by *Polus* in *Erasmus* his *Exorcismus*, when pretending that he saw a huge Dragon with fiery Horns in the Sky, by avouching it strongly, and pointing expressly to the place, he forced them (out of shame not to see so perspicuous a thing) to confess that they saw it also. That it is not *absolutely clear* and *manifest of it self*, the *pains* and the *ways* he takes to make it out, sufficiently evince. And whether it be *clear* and *manifest* even *to himself* we have cause to doubt; because the Proposition in debate, [viz. *That God hath prohibited the worshipping himself by an Image in the second Commandment*] not being acknowledged by the *Church* of *Rome* for an *Article* of *Faith*, the *Church* of *England*, says he, *obliges* no man to *assent* to it, but onely *not* to *oppose* it; and yet on the other side, every man is bound to *assent* to *that* which he sees to be *clear* and *manifest*. Such frequent

ſelf-contradictions are the natural Conſequences of a Diſcourſe not grounded upon Truth; And although the Reader may think I take a *delight* to diſcover them in my Adverſary, yet I can aſſure him 'tis a much greater *Grief* to me to ſee ſo ſubtil a Wit ſo often entangled in them. The fault is in the *Cauſe*, which cannot be managed without falling into them. But as St. *Auſtin* ſays, *Quis coegit eos malam cauſam habere?* Who forced him and his Partizans to engage in a bad Cauſe? Nothing of *Faith*, if it be true which he tells us in his *Rational Account*: Nothing of *Reaſon* as I ſhall ſhew in the Examination of his Proofs.

4. The firſt way he takes to prove that *God in the ſecond Commandment hath expreſly prohibited the giving any Worſhip to himſelf by an Image*, is from *the Terms in which the Law is expreſſed*. And what are they in the *Proteſtants* own Tranſlation *Exod.*20.4? *Thou ſhalt not make unto thee any graven Image, or any likeneſs of any thing*, &c. *Thou ſhalt not bow down thy ſelf to them, nor ſerve them.* Theſe are the *Terms* in which the *Law* is expreſſed, and where I pray, is it *expreſſed* here, that *we may not give any Worſhip to God himſelf by an Image?* The firſt part touches not the *Worſhip* of *Images*, nor of *God* himſelf *by them*; but onely the *making* them; and gives matter to Divines to diſpute whe-

ther

ther it be forbidden by this Commandment to *make* any Image or any Likeneſs at all? A thing in which *Catholicks* and *Proteſtants* are equally concerned. The ſecond forbids indeed in expreſs terms, to *bow* our ſelves down to the *Images themſelves*, but ſpeaks not *one word* of the lawfulneſs or unlawfulneſs of worſhipping *God himſelf* by them. So that in caſe we have not here another of the Doctors *Identical* Propoſitions, viz. that *to treat a matter expreſly*, is the ſame in other words, as *not to ſpeak of it at all*, it is manifeſt, that to worſhip *God* himſelf before or by an *Image*, is not *expreſly* prohibited in this Commandment. Let the *Proteſtant* Reader conſider this well, and not ſuffer himſelf to be deluded with the ſound of words. To bow our ſelves down to the Images themſelves, without any Relation to God, is by the Conceſſion *of all* to worſhip *them* inſtead of *God*. And is it all one *to worſhip an Image inſtead of God*, and *to worſhip God himſelf by bowing before an Image?* The difference is *too palpable* not to be ſeen by any one who hath not the *natural* Conceptions of his mind *corrupted* by an over-eager deſire to purſue at any rate ſo unjuſt and uncharitable a Charge as that of Idolatry. The *Jews* we know did worſhip God by bowing down before the *Ark* and the *Cherubims*, and yet they did not worſhip *them inſtead*

ſtead of God. And if the Doctor will needs contend that this was a particular *diſpenſation* to the *Jews*, that they might lawfully bow down before the *Ark* and the *Cherubims*, to worſhip God; he muſt acknowledge the *Precept* (if it were ſo) as to that part of *not worſhipping God by bowing before an Image*, not to have been *Natural*, for then God had *diſpens'd* with them in committing *real* Idolatry; but *Ceremonial*, and conſequently not to oblige *Chriſtians*, unleſs he will engage them alſo in the obſervance of all the *Ceremonial* part of the *Law* of *Moſes*. Taking then the Terms of the Law as tranſlated by *Proteſtants* themſelves in favour of their own Cauſe, 'tis manifeſt that to *worſhip God by an Image*, is *not expreſly prohibited*, becauſe *not at all ſpoken of* in that Commandment.

5. What I aſſerted to be the *meaning* of the *Law*, was, That *God forbad to give his Worſhip to Idols*. To prove this, I urged 1. The Judgment of St. *Auſtin*, who makes thoſe words, *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven thing*, &c. to be but an explication of the immediately foregoing ones, *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods before me.* 2. That the word *Peſel* in *Hebrew*, in *Latin Sculptile*, (a graven thing) was uſed in Scripture to ſignifie an *Idol*, and particularly was tranſlated by the *Septuagint* in this very

place,

place *Hanover*, *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf an Idol.*

To the Firſt he anſwers (pag. 99.) by asking, How *am I ſure this was St. Auſtin's conſtant Judgment, ſince in his later Writings he reckons up the Commandments as others of the Fathers had done before him?* But before I reply to this Demand, it will be convenient to lay down what was S. *Auſtin*'s Judgment in his *former* Writing, concerning the dividing of the Commandments.

6. In his LXXI Queſtion upon *Exodus*, he treats this Point expreſly, and at large, viz. Whether *three* Commandments only are to be aſſigned to the *firſt* Table, and *ſeven* to the *ſecond?* Or *four* to the *Firſt*, and *ſix* only to the *Second?* And he gives his Reſolution in theſe words. *Thoſe*, ſaith he, 'who *aſſign* four *to the Firſt Table, will have* 'thoſe *words*, [Thou ſhalt not make to thy 'ſelf an Idol; where Idols are forbidden to 'to be worſhipped] *to be a diſtinct Precept* 'from *the foregoing words*, Thou ſhalt have 'no other Gods beſides me; *and thoſe other* 'words, Thou ſhalt not covet thy Neighbors 'Wife, *and*, Thou ſhalt not covet thy 'Neighbors houſe, *with the reſt to the end of* 'the ſecond *Table, to be but* One. *Thoſe who* 'aſſign *but* Three *to the* Firſt *Table*, *make* 'whatever is commanded concerning the 'Worſhip of One God; that nothing elſe

'be

'be worshipped for God besides him; *to be* 'but One *Precept: and divide the last words* 'of the Second *Table into* Two, *so that*, Thou 'shalt not covet thy Neighbors Wife, *is one* 'Commandment; *and*, Thou shalt not covet 'his house, nor any thing that is his, *another*. 'Yet neither of them doubt of the Commandments 'being Ten, *because this the Scripture it self* 'witnesseth. *But to me*, says He, *it seems* 'more congruous *to divide them into* Three 'and Seven, *because those which belong to God* 'seem to insinuate a Trinity *of Persons to such* 'as more attentively look into them. *And in* 'reality *the very* same *thing is more perfectly* 'explicated, *when* Idols are forbidden to be 'worshipped, *which was said in the forgoing* 'words, Thou shalt have no other Gods be-'sides me. Thus S. *Austin*. And then having shown the last words of the *Second* Table, *Thou shalt not covet thy Neighbours wife, Thou shalt not covet thy Neighbours house*, &c. to be two distinct Precepts from the di-stinct Prohibitions, [*Thou shalt not*, and *Thou shalt not*] answerable to the different nature of the Sins forbidden he adds, 'But as to 'that which is forbidden by those words, Thou 'shalt have no other Gods besides me, *it is* 'apparent that a more diligent execution of this 'matter is imported by the words which follow. 'For to what does that Prohibition belong, 'Thou shalt not make to thy self an Idol, or

'any

'any ſimilitude of things in Heaven above, 'Thou ſhalt not adore them, nor ſerve 'them, *but to* that *which was ſaid before*, 'Thou ſhalt have no other Gods before 'me? Theſe are the Words and the Diſcourſe of S. *Auſtin*; in which the Reader may note, 1. That he tranſlates, *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf an Idol*, not an *Image*, as *Proteſtants* do very *artificially*, to make their Aſſertion ſeem more plauſible. 2. That he makes the *ſence* of the Law to be the forbidding to give the Worſhip of *God* to *Idols*. 3. That he does not make it a *diſtinct* Precept from the foregoing words, *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods beſides me*, but onely a more *particular* and *perfect explication* of them. So that if the Judgment of S. *Auſtin* be to be followed, either for the *meaning* of the *Law*, or for the *dividing* of the *Decalogue*, it is evident he ſtands on the *Catholick's* ſide, and not on the *Proteſtant's*.

7. This Dr. *St.* ſaw very well, and therefore found no other way to evade the weight of his Judgment, but to call me to Account how *I am ſure that this was his conſtant Judgment, ſince in his latter Writings* (upon his bare word you muſt take it, for there is nothing in the place to prove it) *he reckons up the Commandments as others of the Fathers had done before him?* He would ſeem in theſe laſt words to inſinuate as if S. *Auſtin*

ſtin had changed his Judgment upon conſi-deration of *what other Fathers had done be-fore him*; but there is mention of no ſuch thing in thoſe *later* Writings cited by *him-ſelf*; and in the *former* cited by me, 'tis plain that he had conſidered the Opinion of thoſe other *Fathers* before him (concerning the dividing the Commandments as *Proteſtants* do now) and that notwithſtanding their Sentiment in the caſe, he rejected it as leſs congruous to the *meaning* of the Law, and the *natures* of the things forbidden. This then was a pretty Artifice to amuze the Reader, inſtead of ſpeaking to the Point. But to come to his demand, How I am *ſure* that S. *Auſtin* remained conſtant in this Judgment, Let us firſt ſee what the words are in the place to which he refers us in his Margin, *Who will ſay*, ſaith S. *Auſtin*) (Contra duas Ep. Pelag. li. 3. c. 4.) *that Chriſtians are not bound to obſerve, that God onely is to be ſerved with the ſervice of Religion, that an Idol is not to be worſhipped, that the Name of God ought not to be taken in vain, that Parents are to be honoured, that Adulteries, Murders, Theſts are not to be committed, that falſe witneſs is not to be born, that our Neigh-bours Wife, that no other thing which is his, is not to be coveted.* Theſe are the words of S. *Au-ſtin*. And his Intention here was no more, but to recapitulate the *Duties* enjoyned in the

the *Decalogue*, which *Chriſtians* are bound to *obſerve*, as is evident, 1. From his firſt words, *Who will ſay that Chriſtians are not bound to obſerve*, &c. 2. From the occaſion of them, which was to anſwer the Calumny of the *Pelagians*, who accuſed him for aſſerting, That *the Law was not given to juſtifie the Obſervers, but to be a greater cauſe of ſin.* 3. From his leaving out the keeping of the *Sabboth*, as it was commanded to be *obſerved* by the *Jews*, which he had before excepted. This was his Intention in the place cited by the Doctor, and not to meddle at all with the *manner* how the Commandments are to be divided; for whether *Four* be aſſigned to the *Firſt* Table, and *Six* to the *Second*; or *Three* onely to the *Firſt*, and *Seven* to the *Second*, the *Duties* which Chriſtians are bound to obſerve, are ſtill the ſame. So that the Doctor has no more ground from hence to ſay that St. *Auſtin* divides them in this place, as *Proteſtants* do, than he has from the very words of the *Decalogue*, as they are ſet down in *Exodus*, where although the *Commandments* are expreſly ſaid to be *Ten*; yet how many belong to the *Firſt* Table, and how many to the *Second*, is not ſpecified. Concerning this, he had delivered his Judgment profeſſedly in the place cited by me, to be the ſame which *Catholicks* at this day follow;

and

and if the *Doctor* queſtion'd the *Conſtancy* of his Judgment, any man of Reaſon would think it had been *his* part to ſhew he had chang'd it; and not to ask his Adverſary how *he* is ſure he had *not* done ſo, when he could bring nothing to prove it, but the very matter it ſelf in diſpute. This I confeſs is a *new* way of anſwering the *Fathers*, and the *readieſt* I ever met with, excepting that of *denying* them. Whether it be as *Good* as *New*, let the Reader judge. I am *ſure* if it be allowed for *good*, there is no more to do, when an expreſs Teſtimony is alledged out of any Father for any point in Controverſie, but to ſtand up and ask the Alledger confidently, *How he is ſure* that the Father did not afterwards change his mind, in his *later* Writings, although he ſpeak not at all to that Queſtion in them. As for the particular point in debate, viz. Whether thoſe words, *Thou ſhalt not make to thee a graven thing*, be to be taken according to S. *Auſtin*, *not* as a *diſtinct* Commandment, but as an *explication* onely of the fore-going words, *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods beſides me?* I am ſure I have *his* Judgment profeſſedly *for* me in his *former* Writings, and having *poſſeſſion* on my ſide, I am yet farther *ſure*, that I ought not in juſtice to be deprived of it, till the *Doctor* can bring ſome better evidence out of his *later* Writings, than a bare

recital

recital of the Commandments; this being in plain terms no other than to *beg* the *Question*. The Reader may note here also, that even in *this* place, cited by the *Doctor* for himself, the *sense* S. *Austin* gives of the *Law* (whether it be a *distinct* Precept or no) is the very *same* I gave in my Reply, *ut Idolum non colatur*, that an *Idol* is not to be worshipped. And if I mistake not, *his Judgment* is to be preferr'd before *Calvin's*.

8. The next thing I insisted upon to shew the *meaning* of the *Law* to be the forbidding to *give the Worship of God to Idols*, was the use of the *Hebrew* word *Pesel* in *Scripture* to signifie an *Idol*, and particularly its being translated *so* in this very place by the *Septuagint*. To this he returns a double Answer. 1. That *supposing it signified onely an Idol, yet that were not enough, because there is added another Word of as large a signification as may be to this purpose, which is* (*Themuna*) *SIMILITUDE*. But this is *nothing* at all to the *purpose*, for how *large* soever its signification be, when taken by it self, yet in our present case, it is limited by the following words, *Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them*, to signifie the *likeness* of something which is made to be worshipped as *God*, that is, to be an *Idol*. And upon this account, as Mr. *Thorndike* (*Epilog. Of the Laws of the Church*, p. 361.) well observes,

Ter-

Tertullian contr. Marcion, li. 2. c. 22. manifestly affirms, the making of the Brazen Serpent and Cherubins, not to have been against the Law, because not made for Idols, alledging the words of the Precept, [Thou shalt not worship them, nor serve them] *for a Restriction limiting the* Generality of a Carved Image. *And this Opinion,* saith he, *I doubt not to be true.* But *to what purpose,* saith Dr. *St. are words of the largest signification put into a Law, if the sense be limited according to the most narrow acceptation of one word mentioned therein?* Instances I doubt not may be brought of Humane Laws, in which words of the largest signification are frequently put in, (and to purpose too) when the Intention of the Law-maker is, that they be understood according to the *narrower* signification of some other word or words in the Law. And that the Reader may see it was not done to *no purpose*, in the present Law under debate, I must desire him to take notice, that the Heathens (as *Origen Hom.* 8. *in Exod.* 20. and *Theodoret Q.* 38. *in Exod.* tell us, when they expound *this* very Commandment) had *two* sorts of *Images*; *some* which were purely *figments* or Fictions of their own Brain, made to represent what had *no* existence but in their own Imaginations, as *Sphynxes, Tritons, Centaurs,* and the like; and *others*, which were made to represent *such* things

things as had a *real* and ſubſtantial being in the World, as the *Sun*, *Moon*, *Stars*, and other like things, which they *eſteemed* and worſhipped as *Gods*. And although the word [*Idol*] as it is generally taken, be uſed to ſignifie any thing that is *falſely* eſteemed and worſhipped as a *God*, whether *real* or *imaginary*, yet the *former* onely of thoſe Images, ſay theſe *Fathers*, are ſignified in *this* Law by the word *Idol*, and the *latter* by the word *Similitude*. From whence it appears that the term *Similitude* in this place, is neither taken in its *largeſt* extent, to ſignifie *any* Image or Repreſentation whatſoever, though with *relation* to the *worſhip* of the *true God*; nor yet in the *narroweſt* ſignification of the word *Idol*, which is ſuch an Image as is made to repreſent for Worſhip, a *Figment* that has no real Being; but in a *middle* acception, for an *Image* or reſemblance of ſome *real* thing, but *falſely* imagined to be a *God*. And it was to the *purpoſe* that the Law ſhould be *thus* enlarged for the Inſtruction of a people ſo rude and prone to all kind of *Idolatry* as the *Jews* were: But ſuppoſing the *Law* to be *Natural*, and not in part *Ceremonial*, it was nothing to the purpoſe to put the word *Similitude* in its *largeſt* meaning, that is, as ſignifying any *Image whatſoever*, *though made with reſpect to the Worſhip of the true God*; when *God*

himſelf commanded the *Ark* and the *Cherubins* to be made for *that reſpect*. What the *Doctor* ſhould *prove* (and it is *his* part at preſent to *prove*) againſt theſe *Fathers*, and the General Senſe of the *Church of Chriſt* for ſo many hundred years, is, that the word *Similitude* is to be taken *ſo* here; that is, for *any* Image made with reſpect to the Worſhip of *God*. But all the Proof he brings, is a confident *I confeſs it cannot enter into my mind how God ſhould have forbidden it by more expreſs and emphatical words than he hath done*; and yet his own words, (p.60.) that *God forbids any Image or Similitude to be made with reſpect to his Worſhip*, I conceive are much more *expreſs* and *emphatical* to his purpoſe, than *thoſe* of the *Law*; for Thoſe bear a great diſpute, Theſe none at all. But to let this paſs; What he endeavours inſtead of proving his own Aſſertion, is, to render the explication brought by his Adverſary *ridiculous*, by a *Compariſon*, much of the ſame *ſtamp* with his *former* one, *of a Princes making it Treaſon to bow down to a Sign Poſt with his Head upon it, with Intention to honour him.* And to do him right, the Reader ſhall have it as it lies. *If a Prince*, ſaith he, *ſhould under a ſevere penalty* (you may ſuppoſe it *Treaſon*, as in the other caſe) *forbid all his Subjects making any Image or reſemblance, with intent to give honour to him by*

kneeling

kneeling before them, would not that man be thought very ridiculous, who should go about to interpret the Law thus, that the Prince did not forbid them making any Picture of Himself or his Son, or any of his Favorites, (for the Worship of these could not but redound to his own honour) but onely that they should not make the Image of an Ape, or an Ass, or a Tyger, thinking to honour their Prince thereby? Much such an exposition, says he, *is that here given of the Law. God forbids any Image or Similitude to be made with respect to his Worship,* (*for it is ridiculous to imagine the Law means any thing else*) *but he* (his Adversary) *saith, This Law must not be understood to exclude a* Crucifix, or such-like Sacred Image, *with an intention to worship God by them; but onely they should not worship Apis or Dagon, an Ichneumon or a Crocodile, or any the most ridiculous follies of the Heathen.* Behold here a quaint Comparison! A product of pure Fancy indeed, that a Prince should be imagin'd to enact a Law so much against *Nature*, and his own *honour*. But to make it run on *all four*, with the Beasts mention'd in it, viz. *the Ape, the Ass, and the Tyger*, ought not the Doctor first to have prov'd the Sense of the Law in question to be, *That God forbids an Image or Similitude to be made with respect to his Worship*, by some better Reason, than [*for it is ridiculous to imagine the Law means*

any thing else:] when there is not *one* word in the *Law* expressing a Prohibition of any such thing, as I shewed above, and the *Jews* were *expressly* commanded to make the *Ark* and the *Cherubins*, and to bow down before them to that *very* end? How quaint soever then the Comparison be, it is grounded on a false Supposition, and so quite beside the matter. I shall take leave to set it down, as I conceive it ought to be, and so leave it to the Reader to judge between us. Suppose that the *Rebels* of *Astracan*, having defaced all Images in the City, had set up that of their Leader *Stephan Radzin* in every Street, and as they pass'd by, put off their Hats, or bow'd to it, with intent to honour him by those actions. Suppose farther, that the *Czar* of *Muscovy*, their lawful Prince, having reduced the City to his Obedience, should forbid under a severe Penalty all his Subjects to uncover or bow themselves to an Image; and at the same time, or a little after, command those which were set up for the *Usurper*'s honour to be pull'd down and burnt, and *others* relating to *himself* set up, to the Intent to *honour* him by them: would not that man be thought very ridiculous, who should go about to interpret the Law to be meant of any Image whatsoever, (though made with respect to the *Prince's* own *honour*) by taking the word Image in its

its *largeſt* ſignification, eſpecially if there were another word or clauſe in the Law, limiting the Generality of the word *Image* to *thoſe* of the *Uſurper?* Juſt ſuch an expoſition of the Law is that given here by the Doctor. Rebel Mankind had ſet up *Idols* and Images of falſe Gods in all parts of the World, to honour that *Arch Rebel* the *Devil*, by bowing down before them; and *God* having reduc'd a part of it to his Obedience, (the People of the *Jews*) forbids them to make an *Idol*, or any ſimilitude of things in Heaven, or Earth, or under the Earth, *to bow down to them, or ſerve them*, reſtraining thereby the generality of the word *ſimilitude*, to ſignifie *thoſe* of falſe *Gods:* And at the ſame time, or preſently after, commands them to make an *Ark* and *Cherubins* to give Worſhip to *himſelf* by bowing down before them. Would not that man now be thought ridiculous, who ſhould go about to interpret the Law to mean by that general term *Similitude*, the forbidding any *Image* or *Similitude* whatſoever to be made with reſpect to his own Worſhip? Let the Reader judge whether *this* I have ſet down, be not the plain *ſtate* of the point in debate between us: and whether there be any thing more extravagant than ſuch an Expoſition of the Law as this here given, except the *Reaſon* it ſelf he gives for it, *For it is*

ridiculous to imagine the Law means any thing else?

9. His second Answer to my Argument is, that the word *Pesel* is very properly rendred an Image, and *doth not signifie barely an Idol.* And what he offers by way of Proof is, that *it is no less than forty several times rendred by the Lxx.* glypton, *a graven thing, and but thrice by* eidoolon, *an Idol, and once by* eikoon, *which is properly an Image.* But granting this to be so, does it any way hinder, but their Judgment was, it was to be rendred by *Idol* in this place? Nay is it not evident, that translating it generally by *glypton, a graven thing,* they had some particular reason to render it by *Idol,* rather than by *graven thing* or *Image,* in this and the other two places? I, but *the word Pesel* is of so large a signification, that he saith it *properly signifies any thing that is carved out of Wood or Stone,* and being so *often* rendred by the *Septuagint* a graven thing, *it is plain from thence,* saith he, *that when they translate it by an Idol, they mean no more thereby than a graven Image.* But what a strange kind of consequence is this, that because *they oftentimes translate it* a graven thing, *therefore when they translate it* Idol, *they mean no more thereby than a* graven thing? As if the sense of a word of a *stricter* signification, were to be regulated by another of a *larger,* and not

* I suppose he means *no less.*

not the *more ample* by the *narrower*; eſpecially in this place, where the words, *Thou ſhalt not worſhip them, nor ſerve them*, are (as *Tertullian* above-cited ſaith) *a Reſtriction limiting the Generality of a Carved Image.* No aſſiſtance then can be given him from hence, nor yet from the *Alexandrian MS. rendring it* glypton *in the repetition of the Law*, Deut. 5. 8. nor its being *tranſlated* eikoon, *Iſa.* 40. 18. nor yet from the *Vulgar Latin uſing* Idolum, Sculptile, *and* Imago, *all to expreſs the ſame thing*, Iſa. 44. 9, 10, 13. for in all theſe places (as They may ſee who will look into them) there is ſtill ſome *term* or clauſe *reſtraining* the words, *Sculptile* and *Imago*, to ſignifie *ſuch* a *graven thing* or *Image* as is made to be *compared* with *God*, or to be the *Object of Divine Worſhip*, that is, to be an *Idol*: from whence the contrary to what he infers, is plain, that when they tranſlate it by *graven Image, they mean no more thereby than an IDOL.* As for that final *Concluſion* of his, (viz. *By which it appears, that any Image being made ſo far the Object of Divine Worſhip that men do bow down before it, doth thereby become an Idol, and on that account is forbidden in this Commandment*;) not to ſpend time in *divining* what *that* is by which *this* appears (it is ſo very myſtical) the Propoſition it ſelf, 1. Suppoſes moſt *falſely*, that *to bow down before any Image, though with in-*

tent to worſhip God, is to make it the Object of Divine Worſhip, and conſequently an Idol. 2. It *contradicts* alſo what he ſaid before, that *to do ſo*, is *Idolatry*, upon the quite contrary account, viz. *becauſe it is forbidden*, as hath been ſhewn more at large above. Let him *not* contradict Chriſts holy Spouſe the Church (if he will not contradict himſelf) much leſs accuſe *her* of *Idolatry*, for worſhipping *God* by *bowing* or *kneeling* before a *Crucifix*; as the *Jews* were allowed to do by the like actions before the *Ark* and the *Cherubins*. When he can prove *this* to be *Idolatry* from the *Terms* of the Law, or any thing elſe, he will do ſomething. Hitherto he hath done nothing, there being *not* any *one Term* in the Law, (as I have ſhewed) by which it is *expreſly prohibited to give Worſhip to God himſelf by an Image*. I advance now to his Second Proof, drawn, as he ſays, from the Reaſon annexed to the Law.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Dr. St.'s Second Proof, from the Reason of the Law, Sophistical. All *Representations of God, not dishonourable to him; nor rejected as such by the Church of England. The Proper Reason of the Law on Gods part assigned, and asserted to be the Supream Excellency of his Nature.*

§. 1. THe *Second* Proof he brings (*p.*62.) to shew that *God in the second Commandment hath expresly prohibited the giving any Worship to himself by an Image*, is from the *Reason annexed to it.* (P.58.) And *that*, he saith, *the Scripture tells us was derived from Gods Infinite and Incomprehensible Nature, which could not be represented to men, but in a way that must be an infinite disparagement to it.* I expected to find this Reason, because he saith, *it is annexed to the Law*, either in the *Law* it self, or in the *Preface*, or in the *Commination* against the Transgressors of it: but it seems he could not find it there himself, and therefore he cites for it, that Text of *Isa.*40.18. *To whom will ye liken God? Or what likeness will ye compare to him?* And that of *Deut.*4. 15,16.

15,16. *Take good heed to your ſelves*, &c. *for ye ſaw no manner of ſimilitude on the day that the Lord ſpake unto you.* And the Conſequence from all is, *a deſire* to know *whether by this Reaſon God doth not declare, that all Worſhip given to him by any viſible Repreſentation of him, is extreamly diſhonourable to him?* This is the Sum of his Diſcourſe: apt enough, I confeſs, to delude a vulgar Auditory out of the *Pulpit*, but altogether empty and inſignificant, when brought to the *Teſt* of *Reaſon*, as I ſhall make appear in this Chapter. The Reader in the mean time may pleaſe to take notice, that whereas he infers now onely from the Premiſſes, That *all Worſhip given to God by any viſible Repreſentation of him, is extreamly diſhonourable to him*, and not that it is *flat Idolatry*, he is either grown *kind* all on the ſuddain, or *jealous* that his *Proof* falls ſhort of his *Charge*: ſince every *extreamly-great ſin*, as *Blaſphemy* and the like, is *extreamly diſhonourable to God*, and yet not *Idolatry*. As for the Concluſion it ſelf, *whether* and in *what* ſenſe it may be *true* or *falſe*, ſhall be examined below; Let us ſee firſt what truth there is in the *Antecedent*, from whence he infers it.

§. 2. The Propoſition he lays down for the *Reaſon* of the Law, is this; *Gods Nature being Infinite and Incomprehenſible*, cannot

not be repreſented to men, but in a way that muſt be an infinite diſparagement to it. And, if this be ſo, what ſhall we ſay to one that ſhould repreſent God in Picture, as a *Three-Corner'd Light* caſting out radiant Beams on all ſides of it; at a little diſtance a reſplendent *Cloud* of *Glory* in a Circular form encompaſſing the Light: *Within* the *Cloud*, near to the Fountain of Brightneſs, *Angels* adoring; *without* the *Cloud*, *Faith* and *Religion* praying; and directly under it, an *Altar* with an inflamed *Heart* offering it ſelf in Sacrifice? Would ſuch a viſible Repreſentation as this, be an *infinite diſparagement* to God or no? If my Adverſary *grant* it, (as he muſt do, if he ſpeak conſequently to himſelf) then what becomes of the *Church of England*? For in the Frontiſpiece of her *Book of Common-Prayer*, Printed at *London* by *Robert Barker* 1642. in octavo, *this very Picture* is expoſed to the Eyes of all her People; and to prevent their miſtaking it, as intended to *repreſent* any thing but *God*, the incommunicable Name *JEHOVAH* is written in the midſt of the *Triangular* Light, and that in *Hebrew Characters*, to ſtrike (no doubt) a greater reſpect and reverence in the Beholders? If he *deny* it to be an *infinite diſparagement*, then what becomes of his Fundamental *Poſition*, that *God being infinite and incomprehenſible, cannot be repreſented to*

men,

men, but in a way that must be an infinite disparagement to his Nature? Whatever *Calvin* denies concerning the lawfulness of representing *God* in Picture, we see how far the Church of *England* allows it in the Front of her Publick Liturgy, and there want not other examples not unparallel to this, in some of *her* Churches also. So that Dr. *Stillingfleet* must either condemn her of *Impiety* in *making* and *exposing* such kind of Representations to the Eyes of the People; or himself of a most gross Errour, when he asserts in so universal a manner, *that God cannot be represented to men in any way but what must be an infinite disparagement to him.* Perhaps he will say, they are not exposed by the *Church* of *England* for Worship. But *that* belongs to the *Consequence.* Our Question at present, is, about the *Antecedent*, whether they may not be *made* without disparagement to *God?* Besides that *himself* not onely condemns them for *Worship*, but also in order to the *putting us in mind of God*; which how strange soever it seem, he avowedly maintains, p. 68. when he affirms, *That they tend highly to the dishonour of God, and suggest mean thoughts to us of the God we are to worship.* But of this more in the next Chapter. Let him make his attonement with the *Church* of *England* as he can. I come now to speak to the point it self.

§. 3.

§. 3. *Pictures* or *Images* made with reference to *God*, may be considered *two* ways: either *as* made to represent the *Divinity* it *Self*, out of an *Erroneous Conceit* which the *Maker* hath of it in his mind; such as the *Anthropomorphites* had of *God*, whom they conceived to have *Eyes*, and *Ears*, and *Hands*, and other like bodily parts, as we have; or *as* representing immediately such things as bear a certain *Analogy* or Proportion to some divine Perfections, and thereupon are apt to raise our Minds to the *Knowledge* and Contemplation of the Perfections themselves: As when *God* the *Father* is *pictured* as he *appeared* to *Daniel* in the *likeness* of the *Ancient of Days*, to manifest his *Wisdom* and *Eternity*; and the *H. Ghost* in the likeness of a *Dove*, to signifie his *Purity* and *Simplicity*, in a manner suitable to our Conceptions. The *first sort* of Representations are an *infinite disparagement* to the Divine Nature; because being infinite and invisible, it cannot be represented as it is in it self by any corporeal likeness or figures. But the *Second* are no way dishonourable to him, because they are not made to represent the Divine Nature by an *immediate* or *proper* similitude, but by *Analogy* onely, or *Metaphorical* signification, as is above declared. And if it were no *disparagement* to *God* to appear in such or such visible forms, it can be

none

none to represent them in *Picture*, no more than it is to relate or describe them in Writing.

§. 4. This premised, I answer to the *Proposition*. If his meaning be that *Gods Nature being infinite and incomprehensible, cannot be represented to men* (either *Properly* or *Analogically*) *but in a way that must be an infinite disparagement to it*; I deny it as *false*. God the *Father* would never have represented himself in a *humane form*, nor the *H. Ghost* in the likeness of a *Dove*, had it been *dishonourable*. Nor do I believe the Church of *England* would have permitted the Divinity to be *pictured* in the likeness of a *Triangular Light*, had she thought it a disparagement. But if his meaning be, that the *Divine Nature being infinite*, cannot be represented *properly* as it is, by any corporeal similitude; I grant it. But then the *Consequence* in virtue of this *Antecedent*, can onely be this, that to worship God by such a visible Representation, *as conceiv'd proper* to his Nature, is *extreamly dishonourable to him*. And in this we perfectly agree with him; but utterly deny what he farther infers *without* any *restriction* or *reason*; that *all Worship given to God by any visible Representation of him*, (whether conceiv'd as *Proper* or *Analogical*) is *extreamly dishonourable to him*.

Having

Having ſhown the *Propoſition* it ſelf (as taken in the unlimited Senſe he gives it) to be *falſe*, it follows manifeſtly, that it *cannot* be the *Reaſon* of the Law. Yet for a more ample diſcovery of his *Sophiſtical* managing of Controverſie, I ſhall give it a farther Conſideration, *as* it is aſſigned by him for the *Reaſon* of the Law.

§. 5. The Queſtion at preſent between us, is, about the *Reaſon of the Law*, viz. Why *God* forbad the making a *graven Image*, or the *likeneſs* of any thing in Heaven or Earth, or under the Earth, to *bow down and worſhip it?* And on the *People's* part, to whom the *Law* was given, it is evident that it *was* to keep them in their duty of giving *Soveraign* Worſhip to *God* alone, by reſtraining them from *Idolatry*. But this it ſeems was too plain and obvious a Reaſon for ſo *Metaphyſical* a Diſcourſer; He ſeeks therefore another more *ſubtil* and *elevated*, and conſequently more apt to lead a vulgar Reader into a maze, viz. What *Perfection* in *God* was the *Cauſe* or *Reaſon* why he made this *Law?* What he aſſerts it to be, we have already heard, viz. That *the Divinity cannot be repreſented to men, but in a way that muſt be an infinite diſparagement to it.* What I affirm it to be, is, *The Supreme Excellency of God's Nature*, to which *Soveraign Worſhip* is onely due, and not *the incongruity of an Image to repreſent*

preſent it, as he often expreſſeth it. The Queſtion thus ſtated, I prove my Aſſertion,

1. From the *Preface* of the Law (the uſual place where the *Reaſons* of all Laws are expreſſed) becauſe the *Reaſon* there aſſigned by the *Law-maker* himſelf, is this, *I am the Lord thy God.* And what is this, but I am the onely *Supreme* and *Super-Excellent Being* above all and over all, to whom therefore *Soveraign* honour is *onely* to be given, and to none beſide me? Neither is there any mention at all made of the *irrepreſentableneſs* of the Divine Nature, or the *incongruity of an Image* to repreſent it to men; But the *ſame* reaſon of his *Supreme Excellency* is enforced anew from the *Zeal* or *Jealouſie* which God hath of his honour, when immediately after the *Prohibition*, he adds, *For I the Lord thy God am a Jealous God*, (as the Proteſtant Tranſlation hath it) by which he gives us to underſtand that the Reaſon why he will puniſh ſeverely thoſe who ſhall give his honour to any thing beſide him, is, becauſe he *is the Lord their God*, to whom onely it is due.

2. I prove it from the neceſſary *Connexion* there is, as of an *effect* to its *proper Cauſe*, between the *Prohibition* of the Law on the one ſide, and the *Supreme Excellency* of the Divine Nature on the other.

To

To make this as clear as the matter will give me leave, I must desire the Reader to reflect, that although there be *no distinction* of *Attributes* or *Perfections* in *God*, but that *All* are *really one* and the *same* indivisible *Perfection* with his Nature; and consequently the *same* with one another, viz. his *Mercy* with his *Justice*; his *Justice* with his *Truth*, and his *Truth* with his *Omnipotence*, &c. Yet *We*, by reason of the narrowness of our Understanding, are forced to *apprehend*, and discourse (for example) of his *Mercy* as *distinct* from his *Justice*, assigning *them* as the *proper Causes* or *Reasons* of several (even contrary) *effects*, which *God* produces by them. When he *forgives*, we say, he does so because he is *Merciful*; and when he *punishes*, we say, he does so, because he is *Just*; so that the *formal Reason*, as conceived by us, why he *forgives*, is his *Mercy*, and *not* his *Justice*; and why he *punishes*, is his *Justice*, and *not* his *Mercy*; and so *immediate* is the *connexion* between *them* and their *effects*, that if you abstract his *Mercy*, there is no reason left to conceive why he should *forgive*; nor to *punish*, if you abstract his *Justice*. But in case you abstract his *Justice*, and leave his *Mercy*, the *effect* of *forgiving* will still follow, and consequently his *Mercy*, and not his *Justice*, must be assigned as the *formal Cause* or *Reason* why he *forgives*.

From hence, I think, I may infer, and lay down this *General Rule*, That *that Notion* or *Perfection* in God, upon which (considered precisely in it self) an *effect* depends, so that it *follows* or *not follows* as a consequence from it, according as the said notion *is* or *is not* considered by us; ought to be assigned for the *proper Cause* or *Reason* of such an *effect*. But so it is in our present case, that if we consider the Divine Nature precisely as *Supreamly Excellent* (abstracting from its *Incongruity* to be represented) it necessarily follows, that *Soveraign Worship* is due onely to *It*, and not to be given to any other either *Image* or *Thing*. But if we consider it as *Invisible* onely, and *Irrepresentable*, (abstracting from the *notion* of *Supreme Excellency*) it doth not follow on that account precisely, that *Soveraign Worship*, or indeed *any Worship* at all is due unto it. An *Angel* is invisible and cannot be represented as he is; doth it therefore follow that *Soveraign Worship* is due to him? Or that *any Worship* at all is to be given to a *Sound*, because it cannot be *painted*? *Excellency* then, and not *Invisibility*, is the *Formal Reason* of *Worship*. Whether a thing *can* or *cannot* be represented by an Image or Picture, if it have no *Excellency*, no *Worship* is due unto it: and if it have *Excellency*, Worship is due to it, according to the degree

gree of *Excellency* it is endowed with. And upon that account *Soveraign Civil Worſhip* was equally due from the People to *Moſes*, being conſtituted their Prince by God, when his Picture could be drawn, as when it could *not* becauſe of the ſhining of his face; or when he kept on his Vail, or put it off: And God himſelf was no leſs adorable when he appeared to *Daniel* like the *Ancient of Days*, than when he gave the *Law* to *Moſes* without any *Similitude*: To conclude, to be *Supremely-Excellent* is *Proper* to God alone; *Not-to-be-repreſentable* by an Image, is *Common* to *Him* with *Angels*, though in a higher degree: and however it enter *materially*, or *à parte rei*, (as the Schools ſpeak) as the other Attributes of *Truth*, *Wiſdom*, *Goodneſs*, &c. do, to conſtitute the Divine Nature *Supremely-Excellent*; yet it is manifeſt that his *Excellency* preciſely, and none of the other Attributes, is the immediate and formal reaſon why *Soveraign Worſhip* is to be given to none but Him; and conſequently why this Law was made particularly to forbid it to be given (as at that time it was given by the *Heathen*) to *Graven Things*, that is, Repreſentations of Imaginary Beings; or *to any Similitude*, that is, the likeneſs of any thing, which although it had a real Being, yet was not *God*.

3*dly*. *Ad hominem*, I argue thus. What follows *precisely* from the Divine Nature's being *Invisible* and *Irrepresentable* (abstracting from its *Supreme Excellency*, the proper Object of *Latria*) is onely *this*, that men *therefore* ought not to presume to make any *Image* or likeness, to *represent* it as it is: and the *Law* in virtue of it, must be *to forbid the making any such Image*: But Dr. *St.* utterly denies the *Law* we treat of to contain any *such* Prohibition in it, as appears by his words against *Bellarmin* and others, pag. 77. —— [*As though ever any Men were such fools to believe an Image could perfectly represent an Infinite Being; or that God need to make a Law to forbid that which is utterly impossible in the very nature of the thing: He might more reasonably forbid men to paint a Sound,*·····*or to make new Worlds, than to command them not to make any Image which should perfectly represent his Nature.*] Thus he, to shew the *Law* meant nothing less than to *forbid* men to make an *Image* of *God*; which yet is *all* that follows in virtue of his *not* being *representable* by any corporeal figure. Therefore, according to *himself*, the *irrepresentableness* of the Divine Nature, as *precisely* consider'd, cannot be assigned for the *Proper Cause* or *Reason* of this Law. Thus much from Reason.

§. 6. I come now to the places of *Scripture*; *which*, he ſaith, *tell us*, that the *Reaſon* of the Law was, That God's Nature being Infinite, *could not be repreſented but in a way that muſt be an infinite diſparagement to him.*

To the firſt, *Iſa.* 40. 18. *To whom will ye liken God? Or what likeneſs will ye compare unto him?* I anſwer, The Prophet tells us, that nothing is or can be like or compared to God; but where doth he tell us that this is the Reaſon of the Law, unleſs we are bound to believe it becauſe Dr. *St.* ſaith it? There is a likeneſs of *Repreſentation*, and a *likeneſs* of *Compariſon* (as the words themſelves ſeem to import) but neither of them evince what he intends. For if the words be to be underſtood of *likeneſs* in *Repreſentation*, all that can be inferr'd from them, is, that ſuch a *likeneſs* is not to be made; the *Prohibition* whereof, as the *Doctor* denies to be any part of the *Law*; ſo the thing it ſelf makes nothing againſt *Catholicks*, who abhor the very thought of *making* any ſuch likeneſs; and the *Council of Trent*, *Seſſ.* 25. expreſly enjoyns her *Paſtors*, for preventing any miſtake in ignorant and unlearned Perſons, *When ſome Hiſtorical paſſage of H. Scripture concerning God, is repreſented in Picture, to teach them that the Divinity it ſelf is not thereby figured, as if it could be ſeen with cor-*

poreal Eyes, or drawn in Colours, or expreſſed in Figures; but that ſuch kind of Pictures are onely Repreſentations of ſome *Apparition* or *Action* of God, in a way proportionable to our Humane Conception. But if the Prophet ſpeak not of a *likeneſs* in *Repreſentation*, but in *Compariſon*, as the Contents of the Chapter in the *Proteſtant* Bible affirm in theſe words, *The Prophet comforteth the People v.* 18. *by the Incomparableneſs of God:* that is, if his intent be (as their own *Annotation* hath it upon that place, *Bible in Quarto*, 1610.) *to arm them againſt the Idolatry wherewith they ſhould be tempted in Babylon*, by ſhewing that none of the *Idols* of the *Heathen* were to be *compared* to Him in *Wiſdom*, *Greatneſs*, *Power*, &c. as is manifeſt he does from *v.* 12. to the end of the Chapter; it is no more to the purpoſe for which he alledges it, *viz. Therefore it is forbidden to worſhip God himſelf by bowing or kneeling before an Image*, than if one ſhould ſay, There is *no compariſon* for *Riches* and *Greatneſs* between a *King* and a *Peaſant*; *therefore* it is not lawful to give honour to the *King*, by putting off ones Hat before his *Picture*, or the *Chair of State*.

§. 7. To the other Text of *Deut.*4.15. where *Moſes* ſaith, *Take good heed to your ſelves, (for ye ſaw no manner of Similitude in the day that the Lord ſpake to you.)* I anſwer,

That

That *de facto* no manner of *Similitude* was seen at that time by the People, that afterwards they might not take occasion (as they were apt enough) to conceive it to have been a proper Representation of the Divinity, and so entertain an erroneous Conceit of God. Notwithstanding, if it had so pleas'd him, when he gave the Law he might have appeared to the People in some visible likeness, without disparagement to his Nature, as it is likely he did in a glorious manner to *Moses*, at the Second giving of the Law, (when he *descended and stood with him on the Rock, and he saw the back-parts of God, and bowed to the Earth, and worshipped*, Exod. 33.23. & 34.5,8.) and as both before and after he appeared to the *Patriarchs* and *Prophets*; and consequently his *not appearing* so *de facto*, could *not* be the Reason of the Law. For as Dr. *St.* himself confesses very ingenuously, p. 63. *Although God had appeared with a* Similitude *then, yet there might have been great reason for making a Law against worshipping the Heathen Idols, or fixing the intention of their Worship upon the bare Image*; I add, *Even against thinking of honouring God, by an Image made by men*, (if that were the meaning of the Law, as it is not) since such a Law (if necessary) might have been made, and would have obliged, although God had chosen some visible *likeness* to ap-

pear in at that time. The words then (*For ye saw no manner of Similitude on the day that the Lord spake to you*) though cited by the Doctor without a Parenthesis, to make them seem of more force, were not set down by *Moses*, as the Reason of the Law: But the matter of fact was made use of by him as a *Motive* to induce the People to the Observance of it, in a *Sermon* he makes *Deut.*4. to press them to that duty. And this Explication also the Doctor might have found in his *own Bible*, if he had but vouchsafed to cast his Eye upon the Contents of the Chapter, where the *whole Discourse* is entituled, *An Exhortation to Obedience*; or on the *Breviate* on the top of the Page, where the *Arguments* us'd in it are call'd *Persuasions to Obedience*. But *there* was the word *likeness* in the first Text; and *Similitude* in the second, denied of God; and these were enough without considering the *Context*, or the *intent* of the Writer, or the *Contents* of the Chapters, to ask, Whether *God by that Reason doth not declare, that all Worship given to him by any visible Representation of him, is extreamly dishonourable to him?* Now, though Protestants may hold with Dr. *St.* that the *Scripture* is the *most certain Rule of their Faith*; yet unless they wilfully shut their Eyes, they cannot think the Method he takes, to be the *most certain way* to *find* out

its

its *Senſe*. But to draw to a Concluſion in this matter.

§.8. Let us ſuppoſe the *Argument* (notwithſtanding all that hath been ſaid to ſhew its deficiency in all its parts) to be good and ſound, and that, in its largeſt extent, viz. *The Nature of God being infinite and incomprehenſible, cannot be repreſented to men but in a way that muſt be an infinite diſparagement to it.* Let us grant, I ſay, this *Antecedent*, and the Places of Scripture in the ſenſe they are cited by him. Let us grant the Conſequence too he infers from them, Therefore all Worſhip given to *Him, by any viſible Repreſentation of him* (whether *Proper* or *Analogical*) *is extreamly diſhonourable to him.* Suppoſe, I ſay, all this to be ſo. Will it follow from hence that *Chriſt* according to his *Humanity*, cannot be repreſented but with great *diſparagement* to Him? Or, that to *put off our Hats*, when we behold the Figure of his *Sacred Body*, as Nailed upon the *Croſs*, with intent to Worſhip Him, muſt be extreamly *diſhonourable* to Him? What if the *Soul* of Man be *Inviſible*, and cannot be repreſented by any Corporeal Figure or Colours? Will it follow from thence, that *any Picture* made to repreſent a *Prince* according to his External Features, would be a *diſparagement*

to

to him? and any *Honour* given him by means of such a Representation, a *Dishonour?* The Consequence he brings is no better, in order to *Christ* and his *Image*. If then his *Argument* do not at all concern the practise of *Catholicks* in making the *Images* of *Christ* and his *Saints*, with respect to their Honour; to what purpose was it to lay down for the *Reason* of the *Law*, (in which he will have it to be forbidden) That *God's Nature being Infinite and Incomprehensible, could not be represented without infinite disparagement to it?* To what purpose was it to spend no less than three Pages, as he does §. 6. in citing Authours to prove that the *Wiser Persons of the Heathens themselves condemned the Worship of God by Images, as incongruous to a Divine Nature?* Was it to make his Reader believe that *Catholicks* allow of any *Pictures* as proper *Representations* of the Invisible *Deity?* Let him lay his Hand upon his Heart. I have told him the Churches Sense in that Point. What those *Wiser* Persons of the *Heathens* meant, is evident from their *Words*, and from the *Time* in which they lived, to be this: That the *Nature* of *God* being *Spiritual* and *Invisible*, it could not be represented by any thing *like* unto it; and therefore the *Worship* which

which the *People* gave to their *Images*, as *Gods*, or *like* unto the *Gods* they worshipped, was *incongruous* to the *Divine Nature*, and a *disparagement* to the *Deity*. And if the *Germans*, as *Tacitus* reporteth, (*de morib. German. c. 9.*) rejected Images *made in the likeneſs of men*, (which the Doctor conveniently leaves out) *becauſe they thought them unſuitable to the Greatneſs of Celeſtial Deities* (for, Other *Figures* and *Symbols* they had in their conſecrated *Groves*, as the ſame *Tacitus* there witneſſeth, and Dr. *St.* ſuppreſſeth) it was but what the *Light* of *Nature* taught them concerning the *notion* of a *Deity*; which, had the myſtery of *God made Man* been revealed to them, would have taught them alſo, that it was *no diſparagement* to *Him* to be *repreſented* in the *likeneſs* of *Man*, and to be *worſhipped* by *ſuch* an *Image*. His *other Citations* I took upon his word, without examining them; and the Reader may gueſs by *this* out of *Tacitus*, whether it be not likely I did him a *kindneſs* in it.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Worſhip unlawful by the Light of Nature, equally unlawful to Jews and Chriſtians. A ſtrange Paradox advanced by Dr. Stillingfleet, *viz. What can an Image do to the heightning of Devotion, or raiſing Affections? How far his Devotion to the Sun may be allowed in the Judgment of* St. Leo.

§. 1. FRom the Notions of the *Wiſer Heathens* concerning the Worſhip of *Images*, he paſſes to the *Clearer Diſcoveries* of the *Goſpel*, §. 7. and wonders as at *a thing of all things the moſt ſtrange to him, that any Perſons ſhould think this Precept onely reſpected the Jewiſh Oeconomy*; and he repeats his wonder in a higher ſtrain, p. 67. when he asks, *How any men in their Senſes can imagine that Worſhip to be lawful among Chriſtians, which was unlawful to the Jews?* It ſeems he wanted an *Adverſary* to combate, and rather than lay down his Weapons, he was reſolved to make *one*, though of empty Air: For there is not one word in the *Reply* (which he pretends to anſwer) to ſignifie that the Author of it

ever

ever look'd upon this Precept as a *meer positive Law*; (which by his *wondering* he would make his Reader believe) but the quite contrary. For the *meaning* of the Law there given, is this, That what *God forbids in it, is, to give his Worſhip to Idols*; which *Prohibition* being but an *Explication* of the *Law* of *Nature*, muſt equally oblige both *Jews* and *Chriſtians*. Yet to ſpeak to a Point, the occaſion of ſo much wonder. What *Worſhip* is it he means was *unlawful* to the *Jews*, and is *lawful* to *Chriſtians*? Was it to worſhip God by ſome *Symbolical* Figures inſtituted to raiſe their Minds to a more lively apprehenſion of Gods *Majeſty* and *Glory*? No; for this the *Jews* did by bowing down before the *Ark* and the *Cherubins*; and very lawfully they did it, as appears by *David*'s exhorting them to *bow* or *fall down before the footſtool of God*, Pſal. 98. Or was it to worſhip God by ſome Corporeal Repreſentation conceiv'd as *Proper* to his Nature? This he hath been told before, is no leſs *unlawful* to Chriſtians now, than it was formerly to the Jews, but rather more, by reaſon of the clearer knowledge they have of the Nature of God. What *Worſhip* then does he mean? Pray take it in his own words, and make the beſt on't you can. God's being a Spirit, *is given*, ſaith he, *as a particular Reaſon why we ought*

to

to worſhip him after a ſpiritual manner, and not by any Corporeal Repreſentation, as the Jews ſaid the Samaritans worſhipped God in the form of a Dove. This is what he ſaith; and if his words be to be taken with relation to what the *Samaritans* did, he ought firſt to have told us what that was; For as it appears from Scripture, 4 *Kings* 17. 33. they made an *erroneous* Conceit of *God*, becauſe they *worſhipped him together with the Gods of the Aſſyrians*, and as *One* of *Many*, though the *Beſt* of the Company; which neither the *Jews* did, nor *Chriſtians* (I hope) do, but as the *onely true God*. But if his words muſt be taken without that reſpect, as they make up an *Antecedent* and *Conſequence*, viz. *God is a Spirit, therefore we ought to worſhip him after a ſpiritual manner, and not by any Corporeal Repreſentation whatſoever:* As the *Conſequence* will hold as well againſt worſhipping God by any Corporeal *Geſture* or *Ceremony*, as by an *Image*; So the giving him Worſhip by any Corporeal Repreſentation (ſuppoſing the Law not to be meerly *Poſitive*, but *Natural*, and the *Conſequence* good) was, and is alike *unlawful* both to *Jews* and *Chriſtians*. But in caſe there were a particular Prohibition given to the Jews (by reaſon of their proneneſs to Idolatry) of not making any Image or likeneſs for Worſhip, though of God

God himſelf, the Law as to that part is evinc'd to be only *Ceremonial*, from their being diſpens'd with, in the making and uſe of the *Ark* and *Cherubins*, and ſo not obliging *Chriſtians*, but manifeſtly inferring, that *the uſe of Images* (abſtracting from ſuch a *poſitive* Prohibition) *is not unlawful*. From hence it appears how incongruous his compariſon is between the *uſe of Images* and *Common Swearing*: *This* being of its own nature *evil*, and *always dangerous*; *That* not *ſuch*; nor *dangerous* in *Chriſtians*, who are imbued from their Infancy, with a more clear and perfect knowledge of the *Nature* of *God*, than ever the *Wiſer Heathens* attained to by the *Light* of *Reaſon*, or the *Jews* by the *Law* of *Moſes*. Yet is not their ſtate ſo ſpiritual as to put them quite out of their Senſes. The Maxim of the Philoſopher holds ſtill good with them, That nothing enters into their Underſtanding, but what paſſes firſt by the Gates of their Senſes, and no Operation of the *Sight* (the quickeſt of them) is performed without an *Image*.

§. 2. Hitherto the *Doctor* hath been very careful to make his Reader believe him *ſerious*; but who can imagine him to be ſo, when he advances that ſtrange Paradox, p. 68. What can ſuch an Image, (that is, to uſe his own phraſe, *a Block or a hewn-ſtone, repreſenting God to his mind*) *What can*

ſuch

ſuch an Image, ſaith he, *do to the heightning of Devotion, or raiſing Affections?* And he means not onely an Image of the *Deity* by way of *Likeneſs*, or *Analogy*, or *Union*; *every one of which*, he ſaith, *tends highly to the diſhonour of the Deity, and ſuggeſts mean thoughts to us of the God we are to worſhip*, but alſo of the Images of Chriſt our Lord, made *to repreſent his Humane Nature* with reſpect to his *Worſhip*; as is evident by his applauding the *Conſtantinopolitan Fathers* for condemning it as a *great Abſurdity*, (p.79.) the reaſon whereof he ſeems to give in this place, when he immediately addes, *And is there no danger among Chriſtians, that they ſhould entertain too low and unworthy thoughts of God? And can any thing tend to it more effectually, than the bringing down the Repreſentations of him to the Figure and Lineaments of a Man, drawn upon a Table, or carved in an Image?* Thus He; And if he be ſerious, what can I do but *admire* the thrice-happy ſtate of *theſe men*, who living *in* the Body as *out* of the Body, (it is ſo *ſpiritualiz'd* by continual Praying, Faſting, and other Macerations) can mount at pleaſure into the *Third* Heaven, and need not the aſſiſtance of any *viſible Repreſentations* to raiſe them to the knowledge of the *Inviſible* and *Incomprehenſible Deity?* This, I confeſs, is a ſtate more to be *admired*, than ever to be

hoped

hoped for) in this life, by the greater part of the Children of *Adam*. And therefore *God*, to lead man to the knowledge of *Him*, by means proportionable to his Nature, (which, as I ſaid, is to derive its knowledge from the *Senſes*) created the ſtately Machin of this *viſible World*, to ſerve as a *Hieroglyphick* of his *Greatneſs* and *Power*. Next, having choſen a peculiar People to his Service, although he *forbad* them to make the *likeneſs* of any of thoſe things he had created, to worſhip them for *Gods*; yet he *commanded Moſes* (*Exod.*25.10,17,18.) to place in the Temple where they were to worſhip him, a repreſentation of his *Footſtool* and *Throne* (the *Ark* and the *Propitiatory*) with two *Cherubins* of beaten Gold attending on each ſide of the *Seat*, to raiſe their thoughts to a more venerable apprehenſion of his *Majeſty* and *Greatneſs*. Laſtly, the *fulneſs* of time being come, in which he would ſhew the *exceſs* of his *mercy* towards *Mankind*, he was pleaſed (as S. *Paul* ſaith, *Phil.* 2.7.) *to take upon him the form of a Servant, and be made in the likeneſs of Man*, that is, to become indeed *true Man*, not onely to work our Redemption by ſhedding his moſt precious *Blood*, but alſo by that viſible form (as the *Church* ſings upon the day of his *Nativity*) to *carry*, or rather *raviſh our hearts to the contemplation of his Inviſible Deity, Ut*

dum visibiliter Deum cognoscimus, per hunc ad invisibilia rapiamur. And if this were the *means* made choice of by *God* himself, as *most efficacious* (because *most connatural*) to conduct us to the knowledge and love of *Him*; then certainly the *Pictures* or *Images* of his *Nativity*, *Passion*, *Resurrection*, &c. which serve to put us in mind of what he did and suffered for us in *that form of a Servant*, cannot but conduce very much to work the *like effects* in us. And after all this, can any man (not to use his own phrase, *in his Senses*, but) who is *serious*, ask, *What can such an Image do to the heightning of Devotion, or raising Affections?* S. *Gregory Nissen* says of himself, (*Orat. de Deitate Filii & Spiritus Sancti*) That *he* often *beheld, but never without* Tears, *the Picture of Abraham ready to sacrifice his Son Isaac*; though but a representation onely of a *Type* of the *Son* of *God* upon the Altar of the Cross: And can any man, whose heart is not of *Stone*, behold attentively the *Image* of his dying *Saviour himself* with his Hands and Feet Nailed to the *Cross*, and not be *touched* with a *sense* of *Devotion* towards *Him?* Surely he must have lost the *notion* of *Humane Nature* who can *soberly* affirm, that the making such an *Image* with respect to His Worship, *tends highly to the dishonour of the Deity, and suggests mean thoughts to us of the God we*

are

are to worſhip: unleſs to remember that he *dyed* for us, be to think *meanly and diſhonourably* of him. But whither will not a *Reſolution* to maintain an Errour once eſpouſed, hurry the *ſubtilleſt Wit?* The *Doctor's* eagerneſs to make us *Idolaters*, had made him fancy that where *God forbids to give his Worſhip to Idols*, he forbad to *make any Image with reſpect to his own Worſhip*: and this forced him (for I cannot believe he did it without force to his own thoughts) to aſſert that *an Image can do nothing to the heightning of Devotion, or raiſing Affections.* If he think I ſtrain his words too far, (though no farther than what his diſcourſe gives me cauſe to do) let him vindicate himſelf by profeſſing candidly, that the *Images of Chriſt according to his Humane Nature, may ſerve to raiſe our Affections, and heighten our Devotion to him as God.* But then he muſt renounce the patronage of his *Conſtantinopolitan Fathers*, and retract or anſwer his own Reaſon, that if this be done by *calling to our mind the Being we are to worſhip, there muſt be ſuppoſed ſome Likeneſs, or Analogy, or Union between the Object repreſented and the Image, every one of which tends highly to the diſhonour of the Deity, and ſuggeſts mean thoughts to us of the God we are to worſhip:* and particularly *that among Chriſtians nothing can tend more effectually to it, than the bringing down*

the representations of him to the figure and lineaments of a man drawn upon a Table, or carved upon an Image. But what ought we not to do to free our selves from *Mistake*, much more from *Errour?* The Mistake at present (if I may give it so gentle a name) lies in this, That he considers not, that if one thing hath *connexion* with, or *analogy* to another, although *Invisible*, when the former is represented to a Person that understands the *analogy* or connexion there is between them, it is apt to bring to his remembrance the later. Hence it is, that although the *Soul* of man cannot be drawn in colours, yet when the *Body* to which it is united, is represented in Picture, the Representation serves as a means to bring to our minds the Perfections or Graces of the *Soul* which informs it; and not *to bring them down* (as against Nature and Experience he affirms) *to the figure and lineaments of a Body drawn upon a Table, or carved in an Image.* Had the rest of Mortals been imbued with *this Principle*, they had never caused either their *Pictures* or *Images* to be made, lest they might be occasion to their Friends, from whom they expected Love and Honour, to entertain *too low* and *unworthy thoughts of them.* Much less ought *Princes* to permit any *Chair of State* to be placed in the *Presence-Chamber*, for fear of *bringing down*

down the representations of them to the uncouth *figure* of four or five *sticks* put awkwardly together. But this is not all.

§. 3. *On this account*, he saith (p. 59.) *it seems much more reasonable for him to worship God by prostrating himself before the Sun, or any of the Heavenly Bodies; nay to an Ant or a Fly, than to a Picture or an Image.* And I have more kindness for him, if he should do it, than to suppose him therefore (as he supposes himself, p. 70.) to be a *Heathen Idolater*, unless he take the *Sun* for a *God*. *Philosophy* and *Experience* having given me so much insight into the *nature of humane actions, as to know they go whither they are intended*; and *Religion* so much *Charity*, as to believe his *intent was onely to worship the true God by it*. But why does it seem *much more reasonable for him to worship God, by prostrating to the Sun, nay to an Ant, or a Fly, than to a Picture or an Image?* The reason, he says, is, because *in those he sees great evidences of the Power, and Wisdom, and Goodness of God, which may suggest venerable apprehensions of God to his mind*, (so then now it seems that *analogy* doth *not* always tend highly to the dishonour of the Deity, nor suggest mean thoughts to us of the God we are to worship) *whereas a Picture or an Image can have nothing worthy admiration, unless it be the Skill of the Painter or Artificer.*

cer. If this be the reaſon, he ought in my Judgment to have given the precedence to the *Ant* and the *Fly*, (or to the *Ape*, the *Aſs*, and the *Tyger*, brought in by him in a former compariſon) for *all theſe* have *two* degrees of *Perfection* beyond the *Sun*, viz. *Life* and *Senſe*. If the *danger* be, that he is more like to take an *Ant* or an *Ape*, by reaſon of their greater Excellency, for *God*, than the *Sun*, (the reaſon ſuppos'd by himſelf why *we* chuſe rather to worſhip *God* by an *Image*, than by the *Sun*) *on that account* (to let him feel the force of his own Argument, if it have any) *that which deſerves moſt honour ſhould have leaſt given it, and that which deſerves leaſt, ſhould have moſt. For the danger is there ſtill greater, where the Excellency is greater, and by that means we ought rather to worſhip* (he ſays to us, *a Beaſt than a Saint*; I ſay to him) the *Earth* than the *Sun*; *for there is leſs danger of believing one to be God, than the other.* But to return to his former words.

§ 4. Is *there nothing then in a Picture worthy admiration, beſides the Skill of the Painter or Artificer?* I dare avouch for the greater part of *Ladies*, who ſit for their Pictures, that they do it not *purely* to beget in the Beholders an *admiration* of the *Painter*; and thoſe who procure an Author's Picture to be ſet before his Book, intend, no doubt, that thoſe

thoſe who fix their eyes upon it, ſhould *admire* ſomething beſides the Skill of the *Engraver*. I have my ſelf a Picture of a Friend which gives me occaſion frequently to *admire* the great *Endowments* of his *Mind*, but not at all the *Hand* that did it, it is ſo *rudely* done. Something then there is in Pictures beſides the *Skill* of the *Painter*, which may make them worthy, if not of *admiration* for *the excellency of the work*; at leaſt of *uſe*, for *their quick ſuggeſting to our Mind*, not onely *the outward Features*, but alſo *the inward Graces* of the Perſons they repreſent. This virtue they have from their more expreſs repreſentation and likeneſs, even above other things, which have a greater reſemblance in natural *perfections*; and *this* is one Reaſon why we make uſe of *them* ſo *frequently* ſince *God was made Man*, becauſe they bring *Him* more immediately to our Mind, than either the *Sun*, or an *Ant*, or a *Fly*. And this may be the Reaſon (if I may have leave to ſuggeſt one) why Dr. *St.* Himſelf preſers the *Sun* for a Help to *his* Devotion, before an *Ant* or a *Fly*, though inferiour to them by *two* degrees in perfection; becauſe amongſt corporeal things, *Light* is the pureſt, and conceived by us to be *likeſt* to a Spirit. But to preſer them all, and with them the *Ape*, the *Aſs*, and the *Tyger*, before an *Image*, becauſe they have greater natural

perfections than an *Image* hath, may (if it prevail in the World) quite undo the Company of Picture-drawers in a little time. For if it ſhall be made appear much more reaſonable to make *uſe of* what approaches nearer in *perfection*, than *likeneſs*, the *Ladies* may come inſtead of the Pictures of their Friends, to wear *Ants* and *Flies* in *Cryſtal Caſes* upon their Breſts: and inſtead of their own Pictures to ſend them the *Apes* and *Aſſes* he brought in ſo lamely in his former Compariſon, I and his *Tygers* too, when they can catch them, as greater reſemblances of their Perfections. Perhaps he'll ſay, he ſpeaks not of the *Perfections of theſe Creatures*, as barely ſuch, but *as great evidences to him of the Power and Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God.* But how many are there in the World not ſo *Philoſophical* and *Contemplative* as he is, who think more how to free themſelves from the importunity of the *Ants* and *Flies*, and from the heat of the *Sun*, than to conſider their *perfections* as *great evidences* of the *Wiſdom*, &c. of *God*; and yet if they come into a place where a *Crucifix* is, are preſently put in mind of *God*, and teſtifie the venerable apprehenſion they have of him, by bowing their Knee, or putting off their Hats? If he find his Devotion more inflam'd by the *light* and *heat* of the *Sun*, and the *motions* of thoſe *little Beaſts*, than

than by an *Image*, much good may it do him. But this ought not to prescribe to the *Generality* of *Christians*, who I believe experience more frequent and more venerable thoughts of God suggested to their Minds by the sight of a *Crucifix*, than by seeing the *Sun*, with all the *Ants* and *Flies* in the World. 'Tis not the nearer approach in *perfection*, even in the effect, that brings us always soonest and surest to the knowledge of the cause. We see many *Fathers* are not known by their *Sons*, who yet are presently known by their *Pictures*. And *Atheists* deny the *perfections* of the Creatures to be any *evidences* at all of that *Being* we call God: but cannot deny a *Crucifix* to represent to their own thoughts, that Person whom we believe to be God. Pictures then we see have an advantage in *representing*, above the Creatures; though in natural perfections they be inferiour to them. But yet for all this,

§. 5. He says, *He cannot for his Heart understand, why he may not as well, nay better burn Incense, and say his Prayers to the Sun, having an intention onely to honour the true God by it, as to do both these to an Image.* And the reason is still the same, because *he is sure the Sun hath far more advantages than any Artificial Image can have, and the beauty and influence of it may inflame and warm ones De-*

votion

votion much more. I am ſure too, the *Sun* hath far more advantages than any material *word* can have, even the Name of *JESUS* either written or ſpoken; and yet I do not find the *beauty and influence of the Sun to inflame and warm ones Devotion* ſo much as the hearing or reading of that *Sacred Name.* But I perceive he hath a particular *Devotion* to the *Sun* (though it have leſs advantages than an *Ant* or a *Fly*) and therefore muſt warn him in Charity, not to *ſay his Prayers to it*, no more than *we* do to *Images*, (as he very well knows, though he would make his Reader believe the contrary) for that were to terminate his Intention upon the Sun, to put his truſt in it, and make it his *God*; but as for his *bowing* to it, with intent to worſhip the true God, (or *burning Incenſe*, uſing it, as it is uſed by the *Church*, for a Ceremony of like nature with bowing) he may have a Reſolution of the Caſe, how far it may be allowed him, from the Pen of that *Great* and *Learned* Doctor S. *Leo:* and for his farther ſatisfaction I ſhall take the pains to tranſcribe his words.

'*From that Opinion* (ſaith S. *Leo*, Serm. in 'Natal. Dom.) *viz. That the life of Man is* 'governed by the Stars, *that Impiety alſo takes* 'its riſe, *which is uſed by ſome who are leſs* 'wiſe, to adore *the* Sun *at his Riſing from ſome* 'eminent place. *A thing which ſome* Chri-

'ſtians

'ſtians *think they do ſo religiouſly in the obſer-*
'*vance of it, that before they enter into the*
'*Church of S.* Peter *the Apoſtle, which is de-*
'*dicated to the One true and living God, they*
'*go up to the top of the Church, and turning*
'*themſelves to the riſing* Sun, *with low obey-*
'*ſance bow down themſelves in honour of that*
'*Illuſtrious Planet. Which we are exceedingly*
'*ly grieved to ſee done, partly out of* igno-
'rance, *and partly out of a* Heatheniſh *ſpirit.*
'*Becauſe although ſome perchance do worſhip*
'*the* Creator *rather of that fair Light, than*
'*the Light it ſelf which is a* Creature; *ne-*
'*verthleſs they ought to abſtain from the very*
'*ſhow of ſuch a kind of Service, which when*
'*ſome new Convert, who hath forſaken the*
'*Worſhip of* falſe Gods, *ſhall find exhibited*
'*to the* Sun *by the more ancient Profeſſors of*
'Chriſtianity, *will be induced to retain that*
'*part of his old Opinion as probable or allowa-*
'*ble, which he ſhall ſee to be common both to*
'Chriſtians *and* Heathens. *Let the Faithful*
'*therefore abſtain from ſo perverſe and wor-*
'*thy-to-be-condemned a Cuſtom; nor let the*
'*honour due to God alone, be mixed with their*
'*Rites who ſerve the Creatures; for the H.*
'*Scripture ſaith*, Thou ſhalt worſhip the
'Lord thy God, and him onely ſhalt thou
'ſerve, *Matth.*4. This is the Reſolution of that Ancient and Learned *Father*, at a time, whenas yet there were ſome Reliques

liques of *Paganism* remaining in the World. And from it the *Doctor* may infer, That if he do not say his *Prayers* to the *Sun*, but onely *bow down*, or use some external signification of honour of the like nature, *not* out of *ignorance*, or a *Paganish* spirit, but with intent to worship the True God, in such sort as *not* to give *scandal* to the weaker Brethren, it may pass for a piece of private Devotion in a Person so Philosophical and Contemplative as I judge him to be. And this is all which *Vasquez* (so much accused by him, p.129.) doth teach; for as for publick and promiscuous adoring of Creatures, he condemneth it as undecent and scandalous, saying expressly, that *Indiscriminatim creaturas adorandas proponere, esset multis manifesta causa periculi.* If he ask me yet again, *Why he may not do this as well, nay better to the Sun, than to an Image, since he is sure the Sun hath far more advantages than any Artificial Image?* I think I may ask him, why he may not as well, nay better put off his Hat to one of the *Lyons* in the Tower, with intent to honour the *King*, as do it to his *Picture*, or the *Chair of State*; since I am sure the Lyon in *his Sense* hath far more advantage than any Artificial *Image* or *Figure*

Lib. 3. de adorat. c.1.

gure can have; the *Majeſty* and *Generoſity* of the King of Beaſts, may ſuggeſt more venerable apprehenſions to him of the *King* he is to honour. But, to anſwer what for his heart he ſays he cannot underſtand, and give him a clear Solution of his Scruple, I muſt deſire him to conſider, that although the *Creatures* do repreſent *God* after their manner, yet it is ſo rudely, remotely, darkly, and imperfectly, that there is need of a great deal of diſcourſe to diſcover the *Analogy* or Proportion they bear to their *Creator*; They are called *Gods Foot-ſteps*, and to gather the height and bigneſs of *Hercules* from his *Foot-ſtep*, was not the work of every Vulgar Capacity. Whereas an Image (for example) of Chriſt, is ſo apparently repreſentative of him, that upon ſight thereof our thoughts fly preſently unto him: and his Picture is no ſooner in our Eyes, than his Perſon by imagination in our Mind: and conſequently the *likeneſs* it bears to *Him*, is much more apt to *inflame and warm ones Devotion*, than *the beauty and influence of the Sun*. Beſides, that the *Creatures* being ſubſiſtent in themſelves, and evidently the Cauſes of many great benefits to Mankind, the *danger* is greater of *terminating* Worſhip upon them, than upon an *Image*, whoſe formal

formal Being consisting in Representation onely, connaturally carries our Thoughts and Affections to the Person represented by it. By what hath been said, he may see how far the *Defence* he makes for himself (p.70.) by his abusive application of the distinction of *Dulia* and *Hyperdulia*, and of *Supream* and *Relative* Worship, in case he should bow down to the *Sun*, with intent to worship the *true God*, will bear him out. If he go farther, and (as he states the case himself) *pay his Devotions to the Sun as a subservient and ministerial God, though with subordination to the Supream Deity*; at his peril be it: For that which possibly would justifie his worshipping of *God* by the *Sun*, will most certainly not justifie his worshipping the *Sun* for a *God*.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Notions and Practiſe of the Wiſer Heathens in the matter of their Images. The Texts of St. Paul, *Acts* 17. 24. *and Rom.* 1. 21. *Explained. Some of the Doctors Teſtimonies Examined; in particular the Relation he gives of what the Jeſuites did in* China.

§. 1. THe next *Onſet* the Doctor makes upon the *Catholick* uſe of Images, is with a freſh Recruit of his *Wiſer* Heathens, the *moſt Intelligent of whom*, he ſaith, p. 74. *did never look on their Images as any other than Symbols or Repreſentations of that Being to which they gave Worſhip.* What he would infer from thence, is ſo foul, he could not find in his heart to ſpeak it out. Yet I cannot but acknowledge his kindneſs to us here, in comparing us at leaſt with the *moſt Intelligent among the Heathens*; whereas p. 70. he had done his endeavour to inſinuate into his Reader's belief, that the *Ægyptians* (who worſhipped Crocodiles and Serpents, Leeks and Onyons for *Gods*) *were more excuſable than the Papiſts.* To uſher in the *Wiſdom* of the *Heathens*

thens, he premiſes two Texts out of S. *Paul*, *Acts* 17. 24. and *Rom.* 1. 19. as a *mighty Argument*, he ſaith, to prove the *unſuitableneſs of the Worſhip of Images to the Nature of God, to be of an unalterable and univerſal nature.* And I wonder whoever denyed it of *ſuch* Images as are conceived to be *proper* Likeneſſes or Repreſentations of the *Divinity*, of which S. *Paul* ſpeaks in the firſt place; or of the *Images* of the *falſe Gods* of the Heathens, of which he ſpeaks in the latter. Muſt the words of Scripture be always taken barely according to their ſound, without conſideration had to the *Times* and *Circumſtances* in which they were written? That the *Athenians* whom S. *Paul* reproved *Acts* 17. 24. thought the *Divinity* to be *like* to the *Images* they made of Gold and Silver, is evident by his words, as ſet down by Dr. *St.* himſelf, viz. Becauſe *God was He who made the World*, &c. *Therefore we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto Gold, or Silver, or Stone, graven by Art or man's device.* And himſelf grants this to have been *their ſuppoſition.* This then was a *mighty Argument* from the mouth of S. *Paul*, to drive that Erroneous Conceit out of the Minds of the *Athenians*, who believed the *Divinity* to be *like* the *Images* they made; but none at all from the Pen of Dr. *St.* againſt *Catholicks*, who deteſt the thoughts of

of having or making any *such Image*. To what purpose then was it brought, except he intended to make his Reader believe the *Papists* to be no *wiser* than the *Athenians*, who were so possessed with a wrong apprehension of the *Nature* of *God*, that (as St. *Chrysostom* tells us upon that place) when they heard St. *Paul* speak of *Anastasis*, that is, the Resurrection, because it was a new thing they never heard of before, and the word of the Feminine Gender, they concluded he brought them Tidings of some *new Goddess*?

§. 2. As for the second place of *Rom.* 1. 21,23. nothing can be more clear, than that the Apostle speaks there of the *Idols* or *Images* of the *Heathens*; for after he had laid down the matter of fact which he condemned, viz. That *although they knew God, yet they did not glorifie him as God, but changed the Glory of the Incorruptible God into an Image made like to corruptible Man*, he adds also, *And to Birds, and four footed Beasts, and Creeping Things*, (which words were clapp'd under Deck by the *Doctor* with an *&c.* because they plainly declare what kind of Images the Apostle meant) and then vers. 25. tells us that by so doing, *They changed the Truth of God into a Lie, and worshipped and served the Creature, rather than the Creator.* These are the words of the *Apo-*

ſtle, ſo plain that the *Doctor* could find no evaſion, but to tell us, that *St. Paul doth not diſcourſe here againſt the moſt groſs and ſottiſh Idolaters of the Heathen, but, as St. Chryſoſtom* (ſaith he) *well obſerves, againſt the Philoſophers, and the wiſeſt among them: who though they differed in their Opinions of Religion extreamly from the Vulgar, yet they concurred with them in all the external practices of their Idolatry.* And before we go farther, it is well worth the obſerving what he obſerves out of St. *Chryſoſtom. Dices, quid hac ad Philoſophos? You will ſay,* ſaith St. *Chryſoſtom*, if the *Apoſtle* reprehended the *Heathens* for giving the *glory* of *God* to irrational Creatures, and what was yet more ſottiſh, to their very Images; *what is that to the Philoſophers*, or more Intelligent among them? Marry I anſwer, ſaith he, that, what hath been ſaid, moſt of all concerns them: *For they have for their Maſters the Ægyptians, who were the Inventors of theſe things. And Plato, who yet ſeems graver than the reſt, glories in them. Nay his Maſter* (Socrates) *was a great Admirer of them; for this is He who commands a Cock to be offered to Æſculapius. Hence you may ſee the Images of Beaſts and Creeping Things to be worſhipped, and together with them, Apollo and Bacchus.* This

S. Chryſoſt. Hom. 3. in Ep. ad Rom.

is

is what St. *Chryſoſtom* obſerv'd of the *Philoſophers*: And was it not luckily done of the Doctor to make him the Patron of his Explication, viz. that the intent of the *Apoſtle* was *not to charge them with falſe Notions of a Deity, but to ſhew their vanity and folly in thinking they had found out ſubtiller ways of defending the Common Idolatry among them, and inſtead of oppoſing them, made uſe of their Wits to excuſe them?* But ſuppoſe what he ſays were ſo: that the *Philoſophers* were as ſubtil as he would make them, were they not worthily condemned by the Apoſtle, though but for the external profeſſion of praying and offering Sacrifice to the Statues of *Jupiter*, *Venus*, *Mercury*, &c. and alſo to *thoſe* of *Birds*, and *four-footed Beaſts*, and *Creeping Things*, as the Vulgar did? And if *they found out ſubtiller ways of defending the Common Idolatries among them, and inſtead of oppoſing them, made uſe of their Wits to excuſe them*, were they not to blame in ſo doing? But what is all this to *Chriſtians*? To make his diſcourſe from the *Apoſtles* words come home to *them*, he ſhould ſhow that the *Images* by which they honour *Chriſt* and his *Saints*, are worſhipped by *them* as *Gods*, or as the *Images* of *falſe Gods*, as *thoſe* were of which the Apoſtle ſpeaks in that place; otherwiſe the *ſubtil* ways of defending he covertly aims at, wil be as allowable againſt the

Deſerters of the Churches Faith, in the point of Images, as in other Myſteries of Chriſtianity. But to come to the point it ſelf.

§. 3. *The moſt Intelligent Heathens*, ſaith he, *did never look on their Images as any other than Symbols or Repreſentations of that Being to which they gave Divine Worſhip.* What *Being* this was, he doth not tell us, whether the onely *true God*, or thoſe *falſe* ones repreſented by their Images. If he mean theſe *latter*, he knows in his Conſcience he does wrong to *Catholicks* in comparing them *even* to his *Wiſer* Heathens. If the former, he does *thoſe* more right by his *ſubtil way* of defending them, than appears from the Teſtimonies he brings, *They* ever thought of doing themſelves. For all that is *expreſſed* there (and you may believe he would *ſuppreſs* nothing that might make to his purpoſe) out of *Origen*, *Euſebius*, *Athanaſius*, *Arnobius*, *Auguſtin*, *Maximus Tyrius*, and *Julian*, concerning the more Intelligent Heathens, is, that *they did not look on their Images as Gods*: That they look'd upon them nevertheleſs as *Images* or *Symbols* of *falſe Gods*, ſome of his own Teſtimonies affirm, as that of *Celſus* in *Origen*, lib. 7. That *none but a ſtark fool believes the Images themſelves to be Gods*, had he not left out the latter part of it, viz. *Non diis dicatas Statuas*, but that they

they were Statues erected to the Gods. And that of *Julian*, when he ſaith, *They are but Symbols of the preſence of the Gods.* But not any thing is there in them to ſignifie that they worſhipped the *true God* by them, beſides the two words of *Divinity* and *Deity*, which he cogg'd into the Teſtimonies of *Arnobius* and St. *Auſtin* to make his Reader believe ſo. I ſhall ſet down the paſſages both in *his* words and the *Fathers*, that the Reader by comparing them, may learn what credit he is to give hereafter to *his* citing of Authors; and at the ſame time receive a farther Teſtimony of my *kindneſs* to him in taking the reſt upon his word.

Firſt then for *Arnobius*. What Dr. *St.* (p. 74.) makes the *Wiſer Heathens* deny there, is that *they ever thought their Images to be Gods, or to have any* Divinity *in them, but what onely comes from their Conſecration to ſuch an uſe.* And the Reader finding the word *Divinity* in a different Character, and in the *ſingular* number, as it were in oppoſition to the *Gods* he immediately mentions before, and that they *have no* Divinity *but what comes from their Conſecration to ſuch an uſe*; What can he think, but that thoſe *wiſe Heathen* intended to worſhip the true *Divinity* by thoſe Images, and look'd onely upon *them* as *Signs* conſecrated to ſuch an uſe

Arnob. Contra. Gent. li. 6.

Deſerters of the Churches Faith, in the point of Images, as in other Myſteries of Chriſtianity. But to come to the point it ſelf.

§. 3. *The moſt Intelligent Heathens*, ſaith he, *did never look on their Images as any other than Symbols or Repreſentations of that Being to which they gave Divine Worſhip.* What *Being* this was, he doth not tell us, whether the onely *true God*, or thoſe *falſe* ones repreſented by their Images. If he mean theſe *latter*, he knows in his Conſcience he does wrong to *Catholicks* in comparing them *even* to his *Wiſer* Heathens. If the former, he does *thoſe* more right by his *ſubtil way* of defending them, than appears from the Teſtimonies he brings, *They* ever thought of doing themſelves. For all that is *expreſſed* there (and you may believe he would *ſuppreſs* nothing that might make to his purpoſe) out of *Origen*, *Euſebius*, *Athanaſius*, *Arnobius*, *Auguſtin*, *Maximus Tyrius*, *and Julian*, concerning the more Intelligent Heathens, is, that *they did not look on their Images as Gods*: That they look'd upon them nevertheleſs as *Images* or *Symbols* of *falſe Gods*, ſome of his own Teſtimonies affirm, as that of *Celſus* in *Origen*, lib. 7. That *none but a ſtark fool believes the Images themſelves to be Gods*, had he not left out the latter part of it, viz. *Non diis dicatas Statuas*, but that

they

they were Statues erected to the Gods. And that of *Julian*, when he saith, *They are but Symbols of the presence of the Gods.* But not any thing is there in them to signifie that they worshipped the *true God* by them, besides the two words of *Divinity* and *Deity*, which he cogg'd into the Testimonies of *Arnobius* and St. *Austin* to make his Reader believe so. I shall set down the passages both in *his* words and the *Fathers*, that the Reader by comparing them, may learn what credit he is to give hereafter to *his* citing of Authors; and at the same time receive a farther Testimony of my *kindness* to him in taking the rest upon his word.

First then for *Arnobius*. What Dr. *St.* (p. 74.) makes the *Wiser Heathens* deny there, is that *they ever thought their Images to be Gods, or to have any* Divinity *in them, but what onely comes from their Consecration to such an use.* And the Reader finding the word *Divinity* in a different Character, and in the *singular* number, as it were in opposition to the *Gods* he immediately mentions before, and that they *have no* Divinity *but what comes from their Consecration to such an use*; What can he think, but that those *wise Heathen* intended to worship the true *Divinity* by those Images, and look'd onely upon *them* as *Signs* consecrated to such an use

Arnob. Contra. Gent. li. 6.

by ſome extrinſecal deputation, like that of the *Images* of *Chriſt* and his *Saints* among *Catholicks*, or of the Communion-Cup or Table even among Proteſtants. But is this what *Arnobius* makes the *Heathens* to ſay? Pray hear what the *wiſer Heathens* return upon him, when he upbraided them for worſhipping Gods of Gold and Silver, the works of mens hands. *Erras & laberis; nam neque nos æra, neque auri argentique materias eſſe per ſe Deos, & religioſa decernimus Numina.* *You erre* (ſay they) *and are miſtaken, O Arnobius, in what you affirm, for we do not think the matter of Braſs, Silver, and Gold to be Gods, and adorable Deities,* PER SE, *of themſelves.* No, we are *wiſer* than ſo. But how then? *Sed eos in his colimus eoſque veneramur, quos dedicatio infert ſacra, & fabrilibus efficit inhabitare ſimulacris.* *But we honour and worſhip the Gods or Deities in thoſe Statues, whom the virtue of ſacred dedication hath brought into them, and made to dwell in thoſe Images made by Art.* And by *Sacred Dedication* is here meant *Magical Incantation*, by which the Souls of Wicked Men, or Evil Spirits, were *evocated*, and as it were tied to dwell in thoſe Images, as St. *Auſtin* relateth, *Lib.*8. *de Civit. Dei. c.*23. *&* 26. And now I beſeech you judge if this be fair play? When the *wiſer* Heathens ſay, that *they do not think their Images to be*

Gods

Gods PER SE, of themſelves, that is, without Spirits dwelling in them; to ſay abſolutely, that *they denied they ever thought their Images to be Gods?* And when they acknowledge that *they did worſhip the Gods which by Dedication were made to dwell in them*; to tell us they do not acknowledge *any Divinity in them, but what comes from their Conſecration to ſuch an uſe*; as if in the Opinion of thoſe *Heathens* the End of the Conſecration had been in order to the Worſhip of the *True* God, and not to introduce *falſe Gods*, (or evil Spirits) to *reſide* in the *Images*. Nay when they ſay expreſly, that the *Object* of their Worſhip was the *Gods which inhabited in thoſe Images*, and that their Wiſdom conſiſted in this, that they did not worſhip the *Images* themſelves for *Gods*, but the Gods (*Deos & Numina*, in the Plural Number) which dwelt in them; to put for all this, *Divinity* in the Singular, as if their intention had been to worſhip the true God by them: is this, I ſay, fair dealing in a Controvertiſt? To ſet up a Flag upon a Fire-Ship to diſguiſe it, is a commendable Stratagem in an Enemy; —— *Dolus an virtus, quis in hoſte requirat?* But when the bottom is full of Infernal Spirits, to fix upon it the Title of *Divinity*, and that in a larger Character, is no ſuch laudable quality in a *Writer*, whoſe greateſt virtue ſhould

be plain-dealing. But we ſhall ſee more of this in the Citation out of St. *Auſtin*.

§. 4. What Dr. *St.* ſays that the *Wiſer* Heathens deny in St. *Auſtin*, is, that *they worſhipped the Images themſelves; but through them they worſhipped* THE DEITY. These are the *Doctors* words. Let us now ſee St. *Auſtin's*. *Videntur ſibi purgationis eſſe Religionis qui dicunt, Nec ſimulacrum nec dæmonium colo; ſed per effigiem corporalem ejus rei ſignum intueor, quam colere debeo.* *These men*, ſaith he, *ſeem to themſelves to have taken up a more refined Religion, who ſay, I neither worſhip an Idol, nor a Devil; but by or in the corporeal Image I behold a Sign or Symbol of that thing which I ought to worſhip.* And what thing is that? The *Doctor* ſays, *the Deity*; and that indeed is the onely thing they *ought* to worſhip. But was that their meaning? No ſuch matter, for as St. *Auſtin* immediately addes; *They give this interpretation of their Images, viz. that by the Image of Tellus, is ſignified the Earth; by that of Neptune, the Sea; by that of Juno, the Air; by that of Vulcan the Fire; by that of Venus, the Day-ſtar; by another the Sun, by another the Moon*, &c. This is what they meant by *the thing* (they ſay) *they ought to worſhip.* *And if it be urged againſt them*

S. Aug. *in Pſal.* 113.

(ſaith

(ſaith St. *Auſtin*) *that then they worſhip Bodies, viz. the Earth, the Sea, the Fire, and the Air; they boldly anſwer, that they do not worſhip the Bodies themſelves,* ſed quæ illis regendis præſident numina, *but the Deities or Spirits which preſide and govern thoſe Bodies.* Which Spirits, the ſame St. *Auſtin* (in *Pſal.* 69.) proves to be *Devils*, becauſe *they proudly exact Sacrifice to be offered to them, and to be worſhipped as Gods.* Theſe were the *things* which the *Wiſer* Heathens profeſſed *they ought to worſhip by their Images*, viz. the corporeal Creatures of *Fire*, *Air*, &c. or the *Spirits* which ruled over them, and *not* the *Images* themſelves, nor yet *the Deity* by them. And thereupon S. *Auſtin* ſays, that *their puniſhment and condemnation is ſet forth by the Apoſtle in that very Text cited above by the Doctor, out of Rom.*1.25. *Who changed the Truth of God into a Lie, and ſerved the Creature rather than the Creator. For in the firſt part*, ſaith he, *of this Sentence, the Apoſtle condemns the Images or Idols themſelves; and in the latter, their interpretation of them. For by calling Figures made by an Artificer by the name of thoſe things which God made, they change the Truth of God into a Lie; and by eſteeming and worſhipping the things themſelves for Gods, they ſerve the Creature rather than the Creator.* Theſe are the words of St. *Auſtin*: From whence it appears, firſt,

That

That in his Judgment (and I do not read that he ever changed it in his latter Writings) when St. *Paul* condemns the *Heathens* for *changing the Glory of God into the Image of a Man, or Beast*, &c, he ſpeaks of *ſuch Images* as were worſhipped for *Gods*, or made to repreſent *falſe Gods*: Secondly, That my *Adverſary* deals very diſingenuouſly with his Reader, in affirming that the *Wiſer Heathens* did not worſhip the *Images* themſelves, but *through them the Deity*, when 'tis evident, what they ſaid they ought to *worſhip by them*, were the *corporeal Creatures* themſelves, or the *Devils*, which they believed to rule over them. Thirdly, That for any thing appears from the Teſtimonies he brings, himſelf hath found out a *ſubtiller way of defending the common Idolatry among them*, than they ever thought on themſelves; And ſo had he lived in that time, he might in all probability have had a *Statue* erected to him, with the Title of Ἐρμοῦν ὠφελιμώτατον, *Moſt uſeful Mercury*. Let any Intelligent Perſon peruſe his 74th page with attention, and ſee whether he have not made uſe of more than *Mercurial ſubtilty* in every paſſage of it, to blind his Reader. But not to ſpend more time in a matter of fact, which himſelf after all acknowledes tacitly not to have been *neceſſary*; for whether the *Wiſer* Heathens intended to worſhip the *true God*, or

no,

no, he will have us to *ſuppoſe* they did ſo; and we muſt be content to ſuppoſe it with him.

§. 5. He deſires to know whether in this *ſuppoſition, that they were not miſtaken as to the Object of their Worſhip*, but intended through the Images to worſhip the *true Deity, they were to blame or no in the manner of ſerving God by them?* This Scruple I perceive hath long ſtuck in his mind; and as I gave him the Reſolution of St. *Leo* concerning his Devotion to the *Sun*, how far it was *allowable*; ſo I ſhall let him ſee how far at leaſt his *Wiſer Heathens* were *culpable* in the ſuppoſed practice, by a Reſolution which St. *Paul* himſelf gave in a caſe of like nature. Some there were in his time, who knowing an Idol to be nothing in the world, eat without ſcruple of meats offered to *Idols*, even in the *Temples* of the *Idols*. The *Queſtion* was, whether they were to blame or no in uſing *that liberty?* And St. *Paul* declares they were to blame upon a double account, 1. Becauſe *in ſo doing they became a ſtumbling Block to them that were weak*, 1 Cor. 8. 9. And 2. Becauſe *by partaking of the Table of Devils*, they were guilty at leaſt of the external Profeſſion of Idolatry, 1 *Cor.* 10. 21. In like manner I anſwer to the ſuppoſed Practiſe of the *Wiſer Heathens*, that they were to blame in ſerving 1 *Cor.* 8. 1.

ſerving God by their Images, 1. Becauſe the *Images* being inſtituted by Publick Authority for the Worſhip of *falſe Gods, they concurred,* as the Doctor himſelf acknowledges, *with the Vulgar in all the external practices of their Idolatry.* And then again, 2dly, Becauſe, though in the *Schools* they denied them to be *Gods*, yet as *Origen* anſwered *Celſus*, one of Dr. *St.*'s *Wiſer Heathens*, (when he preſſed him with the like ſuppoſition) *They*, ſaith he, *being eſteemed wiſe and knowing men, did nevertheleſs give honour to them ſo far, that the People by their example were led into Error, and their Souls ſo far depreſſed with a falſe Religion, that they could not endure ſo much as to hear any one deny them to be Gods whom they were accuſtomed to worſhip.* Hoc eſt crimen quod Celſo impingimus aliiſq; omnibus qui hæc non eſſe deos fatentur, *&c.* *This*, ſaith he, *is the Crime with which we charge Celſus, and all thoſe who confeſs they are no Gods.* But what is all this to Roman Catholicks? What he would infer, is, that they are alike to *blame* in worſhipping *God* by putting off their Hats, or bowing down, for example, before a *Crucifix*: And who ever ſaw a wider Conſequence? Suppoſe, ſaith Dr. *St.* that the *Wiſer Heathens* did worſhip the *true God* by the *Images* of their *falſe Gods*;

Orig. li. 7. contr. Celſ. p. 518.

Gods; Suppose again, that this was the thing which St. *Paul pitch'd upon to condemn them for.* Therefore *Roman Catholicks*, saith he, were also condemned by him for worshipping *Christ* by his *Image.* Who sees not here that he should have bid us *suppose* one thing more, and *that* the *very thing* in Question, viz. *That God hath forbidden in the Second Commandment to worship him by an Image?* Or if he will not have us to suppose this, whilst he is endeavouring to prove it; to make good his Consequence he must first prove that a *Crucifix* and other like Images used by *Christians*, are *Symbols* and Representations of *false Gods*; or that the *Jews* were alike to blame with his *Wiser Heathens* for worshipping the *true God* by bowing down before the *Ark*: Otherwise the case will be nothing parallel, either as to *Scandal* or *exteriour Profession* of *Idolatry*: But by the Law of Contraries, as the Practice of the *Wiser Heathens* was both *Scandalous* and *Idolatrous* as to the exteriour action, even before the Law was given, because the *honour* given to the *Image* is referred to that which is *represented* by it; so upon the same account the practice of *Christians* in honouring the *Images* of *Christ*, will be both *honourable* to Him, and *edifying* to our Neighbour.

§. 6. By

§. 6. By this it appears how invidiously he represents what the *Jesuites* did in *China*, (p. 75.) when he tells his Reader, that *they never condemned the People for worshipping Images, but for worshipping false Gods by them, and perswaded them not to lay them aside, but to convert them to the honour of the true God: and so melted down their former Images, and made new ones of them.* Who would not imagine by these words, but that the *Jesuites* had told the People that they need *not lay aside* their *Images*, but onely *change* their *God*, or at the most but melt down the *old ones*, & make *new* ones of them. The *Doctor* never met with an Adversary more willing to take a Testimony upon his word, than my self. But this seem'd so exorbitant, that I could not believe without seeing: And it cost me some pains to do it, for the Book is so *scarce*, a man may run through most of the Booksellers Shops in *London*, and not meet with it. At length I found it in the Library of a particular Friend, and what I found there was this, that the *Jesuites* in *China* had by their *Preaching* converted some Persons of that Nation from the *Worship* of *false Gods*, to the knowledge of the *True One*. And the said Converts, to testifie the Truth of their Conversion, (like those in the *Primitive Church*, who burnt their *Books of curious Arts*,

Arts, *Acts* 19.19.) brought a *great heap of Idols*, and *consumed them in a flaming furnace which they had made for that purpose*. This done, *after they had re-edified or repaired the Altar from which they had cast down the Idols*, (it seems they had demolished or defaced that also) *there was placed*, saith the Author, *in their room the Image of Christ our Saviour*; neither doth he say so much as that *It* was made of the melted *Metal*, though that had been no more than of the materials of a *Pagan* Temple to build a Church to the honour of *Christ*. His words are these. *Simulacrorum* (mark that) *ingens cumulus extracta fornace flammis absumptus est. In eorum locum successit Christi Servatoris Effigies, quam exturbatis Idolis in renovatam aram suffecerunt.*

This is what the *Author* reports of the *Jesuites*, and none can or will be offended with them for it; but such as would be displeased with him that should pull down an *Usurper's Image*, and set up the *Kings* in its place. But as Dr. *St.* relates it, (I should say *translates* the words, for he is so exact as to refer us to the very page) it appears with quite another aspect, something like the ruines of *Nabuchadonosor's Image*, but that there the *materials* onely of the

Trigaut. de Christian. expedit. apud Sinas, lib.5. c.16. p.588.

Image,

Image, whereas here the *Images* themſelves of *Chriſt* and *falſe Gods*, are confuſedly blended together by him, when he ſays that the *Jeſuites never condemned the People for worſhipping Images, but for worſhipping falſe Gods by them, and perſwaded them not to lay them aſide, but to convert them to the honour of the true God; and ſo melted down their former Images, and made new ones of them.* I would gladly know what *Images* thoſe were by which he ſays they worſhipped *falſe Gods*, were they not the *Symbols* or Repreſentations of thoſe very *falſe Gods?* How then could the *Doctor* add (without diſtinguiſhing *them* firſt from the *Images* of Chriſt) that the *Jeſuites* perſwaded the People not to lay *them* aſide, but to convert *them* to the honour of the True God; And ſo melted *them* down, and made *new ones* of *them?* Did the *People* at the preaching of the *Jeſuites* caſt *them* into the fire, and *They* not condemn *them?* Did the *People* tear *them* from the Altar, and *They* perſwade them not to lay *them* aſide? Did the *People* conſume *them* in the fire, and *They* make *new ones* of them? Or will he ſay, that the word *Images* being *General*, may be applied reſpectively to the *Images* of the *falſe Gods*, and of *Chriſt?* But where then was his *Fidelity* in tranſlating the word *Simulacra* (uſed by *Eccleſiaſtical* Writers, and particularly by

by the Author in this place, to ſignifie the *Idols* of the *Heathens*) by the General word *Images*? Where was his *ſincerity* in confounding together the *Images* of the *falſe Gods* and of *Chriſt*, with ſo many *Thems* one upon another (and the firſt of them, which was to guide the reſt, ſuppoſing for the *Images* of the *falſe Gods*) that it was ſcarce poſſible for an ordinary *Proteſtant Reader* to avoid being miſtaken; whereas *Trigantius* himſelf had diſtinguiſhed them ſo clearly in his Relation, that it was impoſſible for any one to miſtake, but by deſign? What that muſt be, in a Perſon who dares to charge the whole *Church of Chriſt* with *Idolatry* for ſo many hundreds of years together, a wiſe man will eaſily gueſs. What lies open to every one, is, that he hath an excellent faculty in *reporting faithfully* (as he calls it in his *Preface*, I ſuppoſe he means by *Faithful* there, the ſame as being *True to his own Cauſe*) the *ſenſe* of an *Author*, eſpecially if the *Book* be hard to be found, and the thing done as far off as *China*, and that by the *Jeſuites*. As for the Fact it ſelf, of burning the *Images* of *falſe Gods*, and ſetting up that of *Chriſt* in their room, it was no more (if not much leſs) than what St. *Gregory* did (by whom this Nation receiv'd its *Chriſtianity*) in ordering the *Pagan Feſtivals* of our Anceſtors to be converted to the *Aſ-*

ſemblies of *Chriſtians*: Whoſe *Wiſdom* in ſo doing, is highly extolled and juſtified by Mr. *Thorndike* from the very *nature* of *Chriſtianity*; *which*, ſaith he, *ſanctifieth all times, all places, all geſtures, all circumſtances, that can pretend to expreſs, to procure, to advance, that attention of mind, that elevation of ſpirit, wherewith Chriſtians profeſs to worſhip God in Spirit and Truth.* And that the *Images* of *Chriſt*, among other things, may pretend to *this*, by calling him to mind, and raiſing our Affections to Him, I have ſhewed in the precedent Chapter.

Juſt Weights, Chap. 1.

§. 7. To adde new Colour to his ſuppoſed *Reaſon* of the *Law*, which he will have to be the *Unſuitableneſs of an Image to repreſent the Deity*, he tells us in the next place, that *the Chriſtian Church believed this Law to be immutable.* And to prove this, he cites a paſſage or two out of *Origen* and *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, affirming that *the making uſe of corporeal repreſentations, makes the Deity contemptible, and that Chriſtians have nothing to do with Images becauſe of the ſecond Commandment.* And to this I anſwer as formerly, What Roman-Catholick ever denied it of *ſuch Images* as they there ſpeak of, viz. the *Images* of the *Heathens* (againſt whom they diſputed) who thought their falſe Gods to dwell

dwell in their Images, *Which thought*, ſaith Mr. *Thorndike*, *made them Idols?* or of ſuch *Images* as were by the erroneous conception of the Maker or Worſhipper, ſuppoſed to repreſent the *Divinity*, in it ſelf? Which kind of *Images* are ſo far from the hearts of Catholicks, that we profeſs with St. *Germanus* and St. *John Damaſcen*, cited by the Doctor, *That it is the higheſt madneſs and impiety to go about to make an Image or Similitude of the Inviſible Deity.* And whereas he would make *Clichtoveus* and *Bellarmin* to appear non-ſenſical and ridiculous, for expounding the aforeſaid Fathers to ſpeak of *ſuch Images as ſhould be thought to be like unto God, and perfectly to repreſent him to us*, by adding moſt triumphantly, *As if ever men were ſuch fools to believe an Image could perfectly repreſent an Infinite Being; or that God need make a Law to forbid that which is utterly impoſſible in the very nature of the thing.* It is evident he does but trifle; for although it be impoſſible in the very nature of the thing, to make an *Image* which ſhall perfectly repreſent the *Deity* as it is; yet it is *not impoſſible* for men to be ſuch *fools* as to conceive the *Deity* otherwiſe than it is, and ſo to go about to make an *Image* to repreſent it;

Juſt Weights, ch. 19. p. 127.

Damaſc. Orth. Fid. Lib. 4. *c.* 17.

which is plainly *Clichtoveus* his ſenſe, and *Bellarmin's Anſwer likewiſe*, as the Doctor himſelf confeſſes; yet rather than ſpoil ſo pretty a Compariſon as he had in his head, he goes on to tell us, *that God might more reaſonably forbid men to paint a Sound, to graſp all the Air in the hollow of their hands, to drink up the Ocean, to wear the Sun for a Pendant at their Ears, or to make new Worlds, than to command them not to make any Image which ſhould perfectly repreſent his Nature.* Theſe gay Expreſſions were *too dear* to be loſt, (though the laſt of them, which is the ground of the reſt, were borrowed from *Chamier*;) and *Bellarmin* muſt be made ſeemingly to ſpeak *nonſenſe*, rather than *not* be told he lies. So glorious a thing it is, to ſeem to have Confuted *Bellarmin*.

Chamier de Imag. lib. 21. cap. 3.

But to end this Chapter, Two things I deſire to know of him:

The firſt is, How he reconciles himſelf with *himſelf*, when he makes the *Irrepreſentableneſs of Gods Nature* to be the *Reaſon* of the *Law*, and yet will not have the *Law* forbid us to *Think* of making an *Image* to repreſent it; although this

later

later be the immediate Conſequence of the *former?*

The ſecond, How he will reconcile *himſelf* to his Maſter *Calvin*, who expounding this very Law, *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf a graven thing, or any likeneſs*, &c. expreſly affirms, that *God by thoſe words reſtrains our licentiouſneſs, that we ſhould not attempt to repreſent* Him *by any viſible figure?* If not by *any*, then certainly not by ſuch an one as we ſhould think might repreſent him perfectly. I leave them conferring notes, and proceed. *Inſtit. lib.* 1. *c.* 11.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Second General Council of Nice, called most irreverently by Dr. St. That Wise Synod. *His Constantinopolitan Fathers Objections answered by Epiphanius, and the Answers shewn to be Good.*

§. 1. WE are come now to that *Stone of Offence*, that *Rock of Scandal* (as the Doctor would have it) the *Second General Council of Nice*, *Anno* 789. in which all such were *anathematiz'd*, and condemned as *Hereticks*, who should call the *Images* of *Christ* and his *Saints*, *Idols*, and assert the *honour* given them by *Christians* to be *Idolatry*. What wonder then if he who finds himself comprehended under that *Anathema*, be in such a *passion* against the *Council*, that in contempt and scorn he most irreverently calls it, *That Wise Synod*, p. 76. that is in plain English, the Three Hundred and Fifty Fathers who voted in it, *Fools*, together with the *Pope's Legates* who presided, and the *Vicars* of the *Oriental Patriarchal Sees*, who assisted in it. O my God! is it come to this, that an Inferiour *Rector* of one

one *Perochial Church*, (whose name is scarce known but in the *Bills* of *Mortality*, and was never heard of in the *List* of any *General Council*) shall dare to condemn as *foolish* the Sentence of the most *August* and *Venerable Tribunal* upon Earth! Was he not afraid of that dreadful Sentence of our Lord, *He that shall say to his Brother*, (how much more to so many *Fathers* of the Church) *Fool, shall be guilty of Hell-fire?* What *Order* and *Discipline* can be observ'd in the *Church*, if it shall be lawful for any private person, upon presumption of his own wit, to contemn and deride the *Decrees* of those whom he is bound under pain of being *accounted as a Heathen and Publican*, to hear? Will he plead for his excuse, that he follows the Judgment of another *Synod* held not long before in *Constantinople*, in which both the *making* and *honouring* of sacred *Images* was condemned? Let him shew *that* to have been a lawful *Council*, and not a *Conventicle*, as in reality it was, being called by the Secular Power, and wanting both the *consent* and *presence* of the *Patriarchs* of the *East*, and chiefly of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, by himself or Legates, whom the Fathers of the fourth *General Council* of *Chalcedon* acknowledge to have *presi-*

Matth. 5. 22.

Concil. Chalced. in Ep. ad Leon.

presided over them, as the *Head* over the *Members*, and *without whose Authority, according to the Canon of the Church, no Decrees could be valid.* None of which defects were in the *Council* of *Nice*. Besides that divers of the *Bishops*, who had voted in, and subscribed to the false *Synod* of *Constantinople*, came and *abjur'd* its Doctrine in the *Council of Nice*; and among them *Gregorius* Bishop of *Neocæsarea*, the *Ringleader* of the Faction. Yet Dr. *St.* takes up, and abets the Arguments of that *Pseudo-Synod*, as if they had never been retracted and anathematized as *impious* by the chief Author of it; and scoffs at the Answers of the *Synod* to them as *insufficient*. I pray God he may one day imitate him in his *Repentance*, as he hath done hitherto in his *Passion* against the Images of *Christ* and his *Saints*. Examples we know move much: and possibly it may be neither *unprofitable* to *Him*, nor *ungrateful* to the Reader, to set down the form and manner of that *Bishops* Recantation, and his Reception into the *Church*.

Socrat. *li.*2. *Hist. Eccl. c.*13. & Sozomen *li.*3. *c.*91.

§. 2. Being brought into the *Council* by a Person of honour sent from the Emperour, *Tarasius Patriarch* of *Constantinople* ask'd him, *If hitherto he had not known the*

*Conc. Nic.*2. *Act.* 2.

the Truth, or knowingly had contemn'd it? His anſwer was, that *he hop'd it was out of ignorance: but deſir'd to learn.* And when *Taraſius* bad him declare *what he deſir'd to learn:* he anſwered; *Foraſmuch as this whole Aſſembly doth ſay and think the ſame thing, I know and moſt certainly believe that the Point now agitated and preached* (by this Synod) *is the Truth: and therefore I beg pardon for my former evils, and deſire with all theſe to be inſtructed and inlightned: For my Errours and Crimes are great beyond meaſure; and as God ſhall pleaſe to move the hearts of this Holy Synod to Compunction* (towards me) *ſo be it.* Here *Taraſius* expreſſing ſome doubt he had leaſt his *ſubmiſſion* might not be *ſincere*, but that he might ſpeak *one thing* with his mouth, and have *another* in his heart, *Gregorius* cry'd out, *God forbid! I confeſs the Truth, and lie not, neither will I ever go back from my word.* Whereupon *Taraſius* told him, that *he ought long ago to have given ear to what the Holy Apoſtle St. Paul teaches, ſaying,* Hold faſt the Traditions which ye have received, either by our word, or by our Epiſtle: 2 Theſ. 2. 15. *And again, to Timothy and Titus,* Avoid profane Novelties of words. 1 Tim. 6. 20. Tit. 3. 9. *For what can be a greater Novelty in Chriſtianity, and more profane, than to ſay, that Chriſtians are Idolaters?*

To

To this *Gregorius* return'd, that *what he and his Partizans had done, was evil*; *and we confeſs*, ſaith he, *that it was evil: So it was, and ſo we did*, (by which words it ſeems he made a particular confeſſion of what evil they had done) *and therefore we beg pardon of our faults. I confeſs, moſt Holy Father, before you and this Holy Synod, that we have ſinned, that we have tranſgreſſed, that we have done evil, and ask pardon for it.* Upon this it was ordered, that he ſhould bring in his *Confeſſion* the next Seſſion of the *Synod*; which he did, of the ſame tenour with that of *Baſilius*, Biſhop of *Ancyra*, and others in the firſt Seſſion: viz. that he *did receive and ſalute* (or give Veneration to) *the Holy and Venerable Images* (of *Chriſt* and his *Saints*) *and anathematize ſuch as were not of the ſame mind*; as he expreſſed himſelf in the vote he gave, after he had by the *Sentence* of the *Popes Legates*, and the conſent of the *Synod* been reſtored to his *Seat*, upon his repentance. This is recorded of *Gregorius* Biſhop of *Neocæſarea* in the Acts of the *Council* of *Nice* to his immortal Glory. May it be imitated with no leſs Glory by the *Rector* of St. *Andrews*. May he take to himſelf what St. *Ambroſe* ſaid to *Theodoſius*, *Secutus es errantem, ſequere pœnitentem.* This I heartily pray for, and to this end ſhall take the pains to ſhew with what little Reaſon he abets the

Act. 3.

Argu-

Arguments of that falſe Synod, and derides the Anſwers of the *Nicen Fathers*. If in doing this, I make his *vanity* appear here, (as elſewhere I have done) it is but what St. *Auſtin* tells us, *we ought ſo much the more to endeavour towards thoſe who oppugn the Church, by how much the more we deſire their ſalvation*. And I know not how poſſibly himſelf could have laid it more open than in the *Ironical* Title of *That Wiſe Synod*, he gives that very *Council* to which his Leader in the Charge of *Idolatry*, (the afore mentioned *Gregorius*) ſubmitted himſelf, as to a moſt *lawful Council*, confeſſing, that what thoſe *Fathers* ſo unanimouſly taught was the *Truth*, and the *Tradition* of the *Catholick Church*. Now what they taught, was, this, that *the Images of Chriſt and his Saints were to be placed and retained in Churches, that by ſeeing them, the Memory and Affections of the Beholders might be excited towards thoſe who were repreſented by them: as alſo to ſalute and give an honourary adoration* (or reſpect) *to the ſaid Images, like as is given to the figure of the Holy Croſs, to Chalices, to the Books of the H. Goſpels, and ſuch like ſacred Utenſils: but not Latria, which (as true Faith teacheth) is due onely to God.* What he could find in this definition, for which the *Fathers* deſerved

S. Aug. in Pſal. 36.

Act 7.

from

from him the title of *Fools*, I cannot imagin, unleſs he will have it to be *Idolatry* to reverence the *Books* of the *Holy Goſpels*, or the ſacred *Utenſils* of the *Altar*. But in this the Council is vindicated by *Eminent Divines* of the Church of *England*. For Mr. *Thorndike* freely confeſſes, that he *muſt maintain as unqueſtionable, that the Council of Nice enjoyns no Idolatry*. And Dr. *Field* affirms that *the Nicene Fathers mean nothing elſe by adoration of Images, but embracing, kiſſing, and reverently uſing of them; like to the honour we* (ſaith he) *do the Books of Holy Scripture*. Whereupon Biſhop *Montague* ſaith, *Let Doctrine and Practice go together, and we agree*. Dr. *St.* perhaps will rank them for this in the ſame *Predicament* of——with the *Nicen Fathers*. But herein his *vanity* and *preſumption* will appear, though leſs, than in condemning a *whole General Council*. A farther diſcovery of *it*, he makes in deriding the anſwers given to the Objections of his *Conſtantinopolitan Fathers*. Let us ſee what they are, and with what reaſon he does it.

Epil. 3. *p.* *p.*363. *li.*3. *c.*36.

Gagg. *c.*48. *p.*319.

§. 3. Firſt, ſaith he, ‘*When the Fathers* ‘*of the Synod at Conſtantinople had ſaid, that* ‘*Chriſt came to deliver us from all Idolatry,* ‘*and*

'*and to teach the Worſhip of God in Spirit and* '*in Truth*, they bravely anſwer, that *then it* '*is impoſſible for Chriſtians* (meaning I ſuppoſe thereby the Church of *Chriſt*, not every particular *Chriſtian*) *to fall into Idolatry*, '*becauſe* (he ſhould have added, as the Council doth, the Prophets had foretold, that all Idolatry ſhould be extirpated by the preaching of Chriſt & his Apoſtles, and) '*his Kingdom was always to continue, and the* '*gifts and graces of God are without repen-* '*tance: Which would as well hold*, ſaith the 'Doctor, *againſt the prevalency of the Turk*, '*as Idolatry among them*. And is not this *bravely* anſwered by the Doctor? Doth he think that there are as great Promiſes in the *Scripture*, for the *Turks* not over-running *Chriſtendom*, as there are for the *Gates* of *Hell* not prevailing againſt the *Church*? Or that the Church, which is *Chriſts Kingdom*, could apoſtatize ſo far as to enjoyn and allow the belief and practiſe of *Idolatry*, and the *Gates* of *Hell* not prevail againſt it? If he will not maintain theſe impieties to be true, nor deny what God hath ſaid by the Prophet *Zachary*, *Behold, the days come, and I will deſtroy the names of Idols from off the earth, and the memory of them ſhall be no more*: and this not for four or five hundred years, but to the end of the World, for *the Kingdom* *Zach.* 13. 2.

of

of Christ is to continue always, and his graces are without Repentance; let him give *Glory* to *God*, and acknowledge his charge of *Idolatry* to be *false*, and that Christ hath done what he came to do, that is, (as his Constantinopolitan Fathers confess) *to deliver us from all Idolatry*.

§. 4. The second thing he makes the Fathers of the false *Synod* at *Constantinople* to urge, is, 'That *the Devil not being able to reduce the World to the former Idolatry, endeavours underhand to introduce it, under a pretence of* Christianity, *bringing them again to the Worship of the* Creature, *and making a* God *of a thing that is made, when they have called it by the Name of* Christ. The words here cited were taken out of St. *Gregory Nissen*, in the Oration he made upon his Brother St. *Basil*; and *Epiphanius* in the Name of the *Council* of *Nice*, charges them to have adulterated both the meaning and words of the Saint, by putting *the name of Christ*, instead of *that of the Son*. For whereas St. *Gregory*'s Discourse there was against the *Arrians*, proving them to be *Idolaters*, because they acknowledged *Christ* to be a *Creature*, and yet, *adored* and *served* and put their *trust* in *him*, they wickedly pervert his words against the *Images* of *Christ*, which although *Christians* retain in memory, and *reverence* out of love to him,

that

that is repreſented by them, yet they neither *call* them *Gods*, nor *ſerve* them as *Gods*, nor at any time put their hope of ſalvation in them, as the *Arrians* did in the *Son*, although they believed him to be a Creature. The Dr. thought it not to his purpoſe to take notice of this *Juggle* of his *Conſtantinopolitan Fathers*, in putting the name *Chriſt* for *Son:* No, it might put us in mind of *his* own dexterous managing the *words* and *ſenſe* of *Authors* cited by himſelf, as I have ſhewed in the foregoing Chapter. Only, when *Epiphanius* makes the difference between the *Arrians* and *Catholicks* to conſiſt in this, that *the Arrians truſted in Chriſt, and gave properly divine honour to him, but Catholicks did not ſo to the Images of Chriſt, but only worſhiped them for the ſake of the Object repreſented by them.* He comes Summ. 3. p. in (p. 79.) with a *But Aquinas 9. 25. a 3. and his followers have at large proved, that where any thing is worſhipped meerly for the ſake of another, it muſt have the ſame kind of worſhip given it, which they give to the thing repreſented by it: For as Aquinas obſerves, the motion of the Soul towards an Image, as it is an Image is the ſame with that which is towards the thing repreſented by it: Therefore Epiphanius and the Nicen Fathers are in the ſame caſe with the Arrians, whom they acknowledge to be Idolaters.*

§ 5. I

§ 5. I remember the Dr. in his *Preface* tells his Reader, that *his design is to argue closely*. How much he hath failed in the performance of his design, (if ever he had any such) I have shown in almost every argument he brings: And for the *present argument*, there are so many failings in it, that a *Junior Sophister* in the Schools would have given it the name not of *one*, but of *many Fallacies*. For to make the consequence good, he ought first to have prov'd, that the *Nicen Fathers* were of the same opinion with *Aquinas* and his followers: or that their Argument was so *evident a Demonstration*, that they could not but be guilty of culpable ignorance if they did not see it. 2dly, That *Aquinas* and his *followers* did conclude *themselves* in virtue of so *evident* a proof, to be *Idolaters*; or at least they ought to have done so, for giving the *same Worship* or *Reverence* to *Christ* and his *Image*; to Him, *absolutely* for himself; to his Image, *relatively*, or meerly for his *sake*, as they explicate themselves. 3dly, That the *Arrians* were *Idolaters* upon *this very account*, that they gave *onely relative Worship* to the *Son*, and not *properly Divine Worship*, which St. *Gregory Nissen* saith they did, *because* though they *acknowledged him to be a Creature, yet they ador'd, and serv'd, and put their trust in him as God*. These things he ought

to

to have prov'd, to make his own *conſequence* good, viz. *Therefore the Nicen Fathers are in the ſame caſe with the Arrians, whom they acknowledge to be Idolaters.* But to tell us; that becauſe *Epiphanius* and the *Nicen Fathers* ſaid, *they onely worſhipped the Images of Chriſt for his ſake who was repreſented by them:* and becauſe (not *They*, but) *Aquinas and his followers have at large proved that when Chriſt is worſhipped by his Image, the ſame Worſhip or Reverence is given to him and his Image;* Therefore *Epiphanius* and the *Nicen Fathers* were in the ſame caſe with the *Arrians*, that is, *Idolaters*; is ſuch a piece of Logick (if good) as would have ſerv'd *Diogenes* (had he known it) to conclude all the *Platoniſts* in the world to be *blind.* For thus he might argue from the *Doctors Topicks*; The *Platoniſts*, and all *Philoſophers*, affirm that for a man to *ſee*, there muſt neceſſarily be ſome *union* between the *Object* and the *Eye*, that is, ſomething muſt paſs from the Eye to the Object, or from the Object to the Eye. But *Ariſtotle* and his *Followers* have at large proved, that this cannot be done by *emiſſion* of *Rays* from the *Eye* to the *Object*, as the *Platoniſts* would have it; but by *Immiſſion* of *Species* from the *Object* to the *Eye:* Therefore all the *Platoniſts* in the world are *blind.* What greater *Sophiſtry* can there be, than when there are different Opinions how the

ſame thing may be done, and one of them *really* abſurd, at leaſt *ſeemingly ſo* to others, to make him who does the thing to be guilty of all the *abſurdities* which follow from ſuch an Opinion? Yet ſuch is the Doctors manner of arguing in this place: All Catholicks agree that an Image may be worſhipped for his ſake whom it repreſents; St. *Thomas* and his followers will have this to be done by the ſame act by which the Prototype is worſhipped: Others who take a different way of explicating the thing, look upon this as abſurd, and think they can prove it to be *Idolatrous*: and Dr. *St.* from hence concludes *Epiphanius* and the *Nicen Fathers*, becauſe they ſay onely what all *Catholicks* agree in, *viz. That they worſhipped the Images of Chriſt onely for his ſake who was repreſented by them*, to be *Idolaters*. The Reader I ſuppoſe by this time ſees the fallaciouſneſs of this kind of arguing: and that the Doctor may *feel* it, (if *ſeeing* be not enough) I ſhall preſs him with his own Argument in a Point which himſelf affirms. To ſhew what kind of *Reverence* we give to *holy Images*, and that it is not *Idolatrous*, I inſtanced in *Moſes* and *Joſhua's* putting off their Shoes in *reverence* to the *Ground* where they ſtood, becauſe it was *Holy*. To this the Doctor anſwers, p. 105. Firſt, That for this there was an *expreſs Command*; but in the

caſe

caſe of *Image-Worſhip* there is as plain a *Prohibition*. But let this paſs, though I have manifeſtly proved the contrary. What I fix upon at preſent, is his *Second Anſwer*, in which he avouches, (abſtracting from any Prohibition or Command) that *the ſpecial preſence and appearance of God, doth ſanctifie a place to ſo high a degree, that we may lawfully teſtifie* our Reverence *towards it*, and this *Reverence* ſo teſtified towards the *Ground* by *Moſes* and *Joſhua* in putting off their Shoes, I ſuppoſe himſelf will grant, was not given to the *Ground* for it *ſelf*, but meerly for *His ſake* who appeared there preſent in a ſpecial manner, that is for *God*'s. This ſuppoſed, I ſubſume according to his Logick: But *Aquinas* and his followers have at large proved, that where any thing is worſhipped or reverenced meerly for the *ſake* of another, it muſt have the *ſame* kind of *reverence* given it, which they give to the *thing* which ſanctifieth it by its preſence; for they do not only maintain that the *ſame reverence* is to be given to the *Croſs* on which *Chriſt* ſuffered, becauſe it *repreſents* him to us as *crucified*, but alſo becauſe of his *preſence* or *conjunction* to it; upon which account they ſay the *King* and his *Garment* are worſhipped with the *ſame* act of Civil *Worſhip*. Therefore *Moſes* and *Joſhua* were *Idolaters*

Summ. 3. p. q. 25. a. 4.

for giving *reverence* to the *Ground* meerly for *his ſake* who ſanctified it with his *preſence*. The Conſequence (though horrible to any Chriſtian Ear) is parallel to that of the Doctor againſt *Epiphanius* and the *Nicen Fathers*; and if it have any force againſt *theſe*, it muſt have the ſame againſt *thoſe*. Thus is the Doctor fallen into his own Trap. Neither can he ſave himſelf by having recourſe to an *expreſs command* in *the caſe*; becauſe *Gods ſpecial preſence* is given by him there as a *diſtinct reaſon* why *reverence* might lawfully be given to the *Ground* for *his ſake* who was preſent; and if it were *Idolatry* in it ſelf to do ſo, becauſe *Aquinas* and his followers have at large proved, that where any thing is reverenced meerly for the *ſake* of another, it muſt have the *ſame* kind of *reverence* given it, which they give to the *thing* which ſanctifieth it by its preſence: it follows that *God* commanded *Moſes* and *Joſhua* upon his grounds to *do* an *act* which in it ſelf is *Idolatry*; and this ſounds no leſs, if not more horrible to a *Chriſtian* Ear, than the former. Let him then take his choice, whether he will allow what *Aquinas* and his followers have at large proved for good, or no. If he grant it, he muſt ſhow the diſparity, why *Moſes* and *Joſhua* were not as much *Idolaters* according to his Principles, as *Epiphanius* and the *Nicen Fathers*. If he deny

deny it, let him tell us with what conſcience he could condemn *Epiphanius* and the *Nicen Fathers* for Idolaters, upon Grounds which himſelf denies to be good and ſolid. Thus much to the form of the *Doctors* Argument. As for the diſtinction it ſelf of *Abſolute* and *Relative Latria* (with which St. *Thomas* and his followers explicate their Doctrine) I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak of it hereafter. In the mean time the Reader may piouſly believe, that to give *Relative Latria* to the *Image* of Chriſt, is no more Idolatry, than to give *Relative Regal honour* to the *Kings Garment*, is Treaſon.

§. 6. The third thing he urges from his *Conſtantinopolitan Fathers*, is, *the great Abſurdity* (as they call it, and he applauds them for it, p. 80.) *of making an Image of Chriſt for Worſhip, becauſe Chriſt is God and Man; therefore the Image muſt be of God and Man: which cannot be, unleſs the Deity be circumſcribed within the created fleſh, or there be a confuſion of both Natures after their Union, both which are blaſphemies condemned by the Church.* To this *Epiphanius* anſwers two things; 1. That the Name of Chriſt is ſignificative of both Natures, and that an Image repreſents onely the Humane Nature, and agrees onely in name, and not in ſubſtance with the Prototype. 2. That the *Divine* is no more circumſcribed within the *Humane* Nature in

its being represented in an *Image*, than it was in its being laid in the *Manger*, or nailed to the *Cross*. And consequently that the Objection either of *circumscription* of the *Divine* Nature, or *confusion* of *both* Natures, was vain and frivolous. I, but says the Doctor, *What doth this Answer signifie, unless there be an equal presence or union of the Divine Nature of Christ with the Image, as there was with the Humane Nature?* And I would gladly know what this Answer of his is to the purpose, unless he think that nothing may be worshipped with *relation* to God, unless it have as great an *Union* with the Person of Christ, as his Humane Nature had? He will not deny, I hope, that *the special presence and appearance of God doth sanctifie a place to so high a degree, that we may lawfully testifie our reverence towards it*, and yet that presence or union is not equal to that of the Divine Nature of Christ with his Humane. It is not onely Union, but Representation also, that may occasion Worship; and so we see the *King* is worshipped by his *Picture*, as representing him, though it have not so close an *union* with his *Soul* as his *Body* hath. But what sticks in the Doctors mind (if I mistake not) is, how *Christ God* and *Man*, can be worshioped by an *Image* which represents him onely according to his *Humane Nature?* To this I have spoken already in the fifth

Chap-

Chapter; and himself may satisfie his Reader in the point, by telling him how the *King*, who consists of *Soul* and *Body*, can be worshipped by a *Picture* which represents him onely according to the *Lineaments* of his *Body*.

§. 7. In the fourth place, his *Constantinopolitan-Fathers* urge, that *If the Humane Nature of Christ be represented in the Image of Christ to be worshipped as separate from the Divine; this would be plain Nestorianism.* And what says *Epiphanius* to this? That never any man well in his wits, when he saw the *Picture* of a man, thought that the *Painter* by drawing him, had *divided* his *Soul* from his *Body*, that is, that he had not onely *drawn* the man, but *hang'd* and *quarter'd* him too? Was ever time so fondly misspent as in proposing and refuting such pitiful kind of Sophistry, as this of the Doctors *Constantinopolitan-Fathers?* And yet He says, the *Good Nicen Fathers* (where he means by *Good*, what he meant before by *Wise*) *not knowing what to answer, deny the Conclusion, and cry, They Nestorians?* No. *They lie in their Teeth.* Thus He. But what the *Nicen Fathers* answered like *Good* men and *True*, was this, that *though the Images of Christ* (like other Images) *represent onely the external Lineaments of his Humane Nature, yet when they look upon them, they understand nothing but what is*

ſignified by them. For example, *When he is repreſented as born of the Virgin* (which is, I ſuppoſe, what the Doctor means by the *Birth of the Virgin.* p.81.) *what they conceive in their Minds, is not his Humane Nature as ſeparated from the Divine, but one Emmanuel, true God and Man: and therefore were far enough from being guilty of Neſtorianiſm in the uſe of Images.* Here the Doctor cries out, *Alas for them! that they ſhould ever be charged with the Worſhip of Images, who plead for nothing now but a Help to their profound Meditations by them!* And may not I much better ſay, Alas for him! who, if they Worſhipped the ſame which they conceived in their Minds, could not ſee their Worſhip (which is an Act of the *Will*) muſt be as free from *Neſtorianiſm*, as their *Underſtanding.* But he had had nothing to reply, if he had not thruſt in thoſe Words of his own, (*to be Worſhipped as ſeparate from the Divine Nature*) For they are not in the Objection, as it ſtands Recorded in the *Council.* However, they ſignifie little to his purpoſe, becauſe the *Will* is carried to the *Prototype* as it is conceived in the Underſtanding, nor doth it give to the *Image* the Worſhip due to the *Principal*, becauſe the *Image* is not Worſhipped

ſhipped at all for its *own ſake*, but for the *Principal's*.

§. 8. The Fifth Argument which he makes his *Conſtantinopolitan Fathers* produce, is from the Inſtitution of the *Euchariſt*, which they call *Chriſts Image* 'because *inſtituted in Commemoration of him.* 'And whereas he ſaid, Do this in re'membrance of Me, *He did, as it were,* 'tell them, *That no other Figure or Repre*'ſentation under Heaven was choſen by Him, 'as able to repreſent His being in the Fleſh. 'This, they ſay, *was an* HONOUR'ABLE *Image of his Quickning* BO'DY, *made by Himſelf, which he would* 'not have of the ſhape of a Man, to pre'vent Idolatry. And as the Body of Chriſt 'was really ſanctified by the Divine Nature; 'ſo this Holy Image is by Adoption Dei'fied, or made Divine through ſanctifica'tion of Grace. This is the ſenſe of the Argument; to which *Epiphanius* anſwers, that from the *Fury* they were poſſeſs'd with againſt the making of *Images*, they were driven into another *madneſs*, of calling the *Euchariſt* an *Image*, contrary to the *Scriptures* and *Fathers*. And the Doctor knows that it is a ſufficient Anſwer to an abſurd Objection, to ſhew that the Objector was driven to run into an Abſurdity

ſurdity to maintain his Cauſe. What the Conſtantinopolitans would have inferr'd from thence, was, that becauſe Chriſt (as They aſſerted) made the *Euchariſt* an *Image* of his Body, therefore *no other Image* might be made or Worſhipped. But this They did not, but left it perhaps (as too hard a Task for Themſelves) to be undertaken by ſo Great an Admirer of Them and their Doctrine, as my Adverſary: and at his Door it lies. Onely he is deſired to bear in mind againſt a fit ſeaſon, that the *Euchariſt* with Them is an HONOURABLE IMAGE, made by Chriſt Himſelf, and therefore if he will not deſert his Leaders, he muſt give *honour* to it, nay *Divine Honour*, becauſe although his Beloved *Conſtantinopolitans* call the EUCHARISTICAL BREAD an IMAGE, yet they confeſs it in the ſame place to be NO FALSE IMAGE of *Chriſts Natural Fleſh*, but by virtue of the Prieſtly Conſecration, it is *made his Divine Body*.

§. 9. In the ſixth and laſt place he jumbles together no leſs than *Eight* Arguments or rather Bare Aſſertions of his *Conſtantinopolitan Fathers*, all which *Epiphanius* denies and refutes as *frivo-*

lous

lous and *falſe*; as any one may ſee, who either conſiders the *Objections* in themſelves; or will take the pains to read the *Anſwers* to them at large in the ſixth Action of the *Council* of *Nice*. Which though my Adverſary call *weak* and *trivial*, yet it is no ſign he thought them ſo, when he omitted to ſet them down.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

The Doctors Objection from the Council of Frankford examined, and ſhewn to be no Advantage to his Cauſe.

§. 1. AFter the matter of the *Veneration* due to *Holy Images*, had been diſcuſſed, and defined, as you have ſeen, in the ſecond General *Council* of *Nice*, the Doctor fearing that his *Irony* of *that Wiſe Synod*, would not ſtick faſt enough, unleſs backed with a greater Authority than his own, tells his Reader that it was condemned by the *Council* at *Francford*, called together by *Charles* the *Great*, *Anno* 794. He ſhould have added, *By the Command of the Apoſtolick See*, as it is in *Hincmarus*; but that had been *an apparent diſadvantage* to his Cauſe, and therefore better left out. Nevertheleſs the fact it ſelf he looks upon as *an apparent advantage to it*. And thereupon he endeavours to ſhow by many Conjectures, that the *Fathers at Francford did expreſly reject the Council of Nice, and that not out of miſunderſtanding its Doctrine, as ſome raſhly*, he

Li. contr. Laud. Epiſc. c. 20.

he ſaith, *imagine*: but that really they intended to condemn the Doctrine it ſelf there defined. His proofs are, (p. 84.) *Becauſe the Acts of that Council*, he ſaith, *were very well known to the Author of the Caroline Book; and becauſe the Copy of the Nicen Council was ſent them by Pope Adrian; whoſe Legates alſo preſided in the Council of Francford, and might eaſily rectifie any Miſtake, if they were guilty of it. Beſides, none of the Hiſtorians of that time do take notice of any ſuch Error, and the ſecond Canon of Francford publiſhed by Sirmondus, expreſly condemns the Council of Nice.* To this he adds, *That the ſame Council was rejected here in England, and the Synod of Paris, called by Ludovicus Pius, condemned expreſly Pope Adrian for aſſerting a ſuperſtitious Adoration of Images.* Laſtly, he confirms it from *the Doctrine of the Caroline Books, (whoſe deſign, as Binius confeſſeth, was againſt all Worſhip of Images) and of Agobardus publiſhed by Baluzius, who ingenuouſly*, ſaith he, *confeſſeth, that Agobardus ſaith no more than the whole Gallican Church believed in that Age.*

This is the ſum and force of his Argument, and to manifeſt the inſufficiency of it in order to his deſign, (ſuppoſing the matter of *fact* to be true, viz. that the *Council* of *Francford* did reject *that* of *Nice*, which divers learned men not improbably deny) I ſhall

ſhall ſhew firſt, that *de facto* there was a *miſ-underſtanding* of the Doctrine of the *Council* of *Nice*. Secondly, That ſuppoſing there had been no miſtake, but that the *Synod* at *Francford* had really condemn'd the Doctrine of *Nice*, yet had it been *no advantage* to his Cauſe.

§. 2. Firſt, there was a *miſunderſtanding* of the Doctrine of the *Council* of *Nice*. And to make this evident, I ſhall need no more than to compare what was taught in the *Council* of *Nice*, with what was condemn'd in the *Council* of *Francford*. What the *Council* of *Nice* taught, I have ſet down in the precedent Chapter, viz. *That the Images of Chriſt and his Saints were to be placed and retained in Churches*, &c. *and that an honourary adoration* (or reſpect) *was to be given to the ſaid Images, like as is given to Chalices, and to the Books of the H Goſpels, but not* LATRIA, *which* (*as true Faith teacheth*) *is due onely to God*. This was the plain and open *Definition* of the Council of *Nice*. Let us now ſee what it was that the *Synod* of *Francford* condemned. *Allata eſt in medium Quæſtio*, &c. *A Queſtion was propoſed in the Council* (ſaith the Author of the *Caroline* Book) *concerning the late Synod of the Greeks held at Conſtantinople* (a miſtake of the place, for *Nicæa*) *about the adoring of Images*: In qua ſcriptum habebatur, *In which there was writ-*

ten,

ten, that those should be anathematized, who did not give service and adoration to Images of the Saints, as to the Divine Trinity. Now, saith the said Author, *our most Holy Fathers denying by all means Service and Adoration, did both contemn and unanimously condemn the said Synod.* This is what the *Fathers* of the *Synod* at *Francford* condemned, as it stands represented by the Author himself of the *Carolin Book*, to whom my Adversary saith, that the *Acts of the Council were very well known*, and by *Goldastus* in Sir *Henry Spelman*, who cites them as the very words of the *Council*, and I suppose by *Sirmondus* also; for had he published any thing else, the *Doctor* would not have failed to let us know it. And now I appeal to any indifferent Reader, whether there were not a great *misunderstanding* of the *Doctrine* of the *Council* of *Nice*. For had the *Fathers* of *Francford* rightly understood that the *Council* of *Nice* decl r'd onely an *honourary Worship to be given to Images, like as to the H. Cross and to the Books of H. Scriptures*, &c. *and not Latria, or the Worship due only to God*, they could never have condemn'd it for defining that *the same Service and Worship was to be given to Images as to the Divine Trinity.* And therefore Mr. *Thorndike* ingenuously professeth, that *It is to be granted, that whosoever*

Concil. To. 1. p. 307.

ever it was that writ the Book againſt Images under the Name of Charles the Great, did underſtand the Council to enjoyn the Worſhip of God to be given to the Image of our Lord. But it is not to be denied that it was a meer miſtake, and that the Council acknowledging that ſubmiſſion of the heart which the Excellence of God onely challenges, proper to the H. Trinity, maintains a ſignification of that eſteem to be paid to the Image of our Lord. It is evident then there was a grand miſtake: And to omit what *Bellarmin* and others ſay of the occaſion of it, *Petrus de Marca* (the late learned *Archbiſhop* of *Paris*) very probably judges it to have riſen from the words of *Conſtantinus* Biſhop of *Conſtantia* in *Cyprus*, *unskilfully* rendred by the *Latine Tranſlator*. For (as he well obſerveth) the *Council* of *Francford* did not condemn the *plain* and *open Definition* of the Council of *Nice*, but (as the *Canon* it ſelf of *Francford* ſpeaks) *Quod ſcriptum habebatur*, for that *there was found written in the Acts of that* Council, *that the Worſhip due unto God, was to be given to Images.* And the Author of the *Caroline* Book tells us, that this was found written in the Sentence of the aforeſaid *Conſtantinus*,

Epilog. part. 3. p. 363.

De Concord. ſacerd. & Imp. li. 2. c. 17. ex edit. Baluzii.

Conc. Nic. Act. 3.

ſtantinus, whom therefore he condemns of precipitancy and folly in theſe words, *Infanſte & præcipitanter ſive inſipienter Conſtantinus Conſtantiæ Cypri Epiſcopus dixit, ſuſcipio & amplector honorabiliter ſanctas & venerandas Imagines, & quæ ſecundum ſervitium adorationis quæ ſubſtantiali & vivificatrici Trinitati emitto.* But inſtead of precipitancy and folly in *Conſtantinus*, he ſhould have laid the fault upon the ignorance of the *Tranſlator*, or his own, if not his *malice*. For the ſenſe in *Greek* is plain and facil to be this: *Suſcipio & honorariè amplector ſanctas & venerabiles Imagines. Et adorationem ſecundum Latriam ſoli ſuperſubſtantiali & vivificæ Trinitati impendo.* 'I receive and with honour em-'brace the holy and venerable Images (*of 'Chriſt and his Saints*) but for adoration of 'Latria, I give it onely to the ſuperſubſtan-'tial and Life-giving Trinity. From whence it is is plain how ignorantly or maliciouſly rather it was ſaid by *Calvin*, that the ſame *Conſtantinus* profeſſed he *did reverently embrace the ſaid holy Images*, cultumque honoris, qui vivificæ Trinitati debetur, ſe illis exhibiturum, *and that he would give that Worſhip to them which is due to the Holy Trinity*; when what he profeſſed, was the quite contrary. Such *Arts* as theſe were enough to make a man ſuſpect

Inſtit. lib. I. *c.* 11. §. 16.

a *good* Cauſe, much more to deſert a *bad one.* But whether this were the occaſion or no, 'tis evident (as I ſhewed before) that there was a great *miſtake*, and while the *matter* of *fact* is evident, my Adverſary labours in vain to argue from Conjectures, that it was not poſſible, eſpecially ſince the Copy of the Acts of the *Nicene* Council, was ſo *unskilfully* if not *maliciouſly* tranſlated, as to miniſter matter of miſtake; and though the *Popes Legates* could not perſwade the *Francford Fathers* from being engaged in it, yet 'tis certain they *reclaimed* againſt their proceedings; and if the *Fathers* at *Francford* perſiſted in their miſtake, what wonder if the Hiſtorians of that time, who favour'd them, took no notice of it? Or if the *Engliſh Hiſtorians* ran into the ſame *Errour*, as it is manifeſt they did, by what *Hoveden* reports, that the *Engliſh* Biſhops believed the Doctrine of the Council of *Nice* to be, that *Adoration was to be given to Images, which the* Church *of* Chriſt *abhors?* That the Author of the *Caroline* Book, and *Agobardus* after him, did not content themſelves with what the Council of *Francford* had condemned, viz. *That Worſhip was not to be given to Images, as to the Holy Trinity*; but denied any veneration at all to be due to them

Hoveden Annal. P. Prior. ad Anno 792.

them, (as the Doctor will have it) hinders not, but that the Council of *Francford* condemned that of *Nice* upon a misunderstanding of its Doctrine, as I have evidently shewed.

§. 3. Secondly, But now supposing there had been no mistake, but that the *Fathers* at *Francford* (as my Adversary would have it) had *really* condemned the *Doctrine* of the *Council* of *Nice*, yet I affirm it had been *no advantage* to his Cause, because as himself (p.84.) saith, The *Popes of Rome sided with the Worshippers of Images*, that is, *confirmed* the *Doctrine* of the Council of *Nice*, whereas they *opposed* and rejected the condemnation of it by the *Fathers* of *Francford*. That the *Popes Legates* contradicted it in the *Synod*, *Cent.* 8. *c.* 9. is confessed by the *Magdeburgenses*; and that the *Pope* himself oppos'd it, is manifest from the Confutation he wrote of the *Caroline Book*; and that *no Decrees of any Council could be valid without the Popes consent*, was so undoubted a thing among all *Christians*, that the Author himself of that Book durst not deny it, but on the contrary affirms it to have been the sense even of the *Fathers* of *Francford*, as acknowledging and professing the *last Judgment of Controversies to belong to the Bishop of*

Rome; and upon this account they affirmed the *Council* of *Nice* was to be rejected, viz. for that it *had not been confirmed* (as they pretended, though falsely) *by the Pope*. And if the *Fathers* of *Francford* look'd upon it then as an *advantage* to their Cause, that the *Pope* (as they pretended) had *not sided* with the *Worshippers* of *Images*, that is, with the *Nicen Fathers*, how comes the Doctor to look upon it now as so *apparent an advantage* to the same Cause, that *the Pope* (as he confesseth) *sided with them?* What I can discover here, is nothing but a great improvement of confidence, to alledge *that* for an *Advantage* which in *Church-Affairs* is the greatest prejudice upon Earth. But if the *Popes* confirming the *Council* of *Nice*, were *no advantage* to his Cause, as little is it, that the *Council* at *Francford* denied it to be *Oecumenical, because the Greeks onely were there present, and none of the other Provinces were called*; for what weight soever *the Doctor* may conceive that Exception to have carried at that time, yet 'tis certain now it hath no force at all, since the *Council* it self hath for many hundreds of years been accepted as a *true* and *lawful General Council*, and its *Doctrine* as *Catholick* by all the *Provinces* of *Christendom*, and the *contrary* to it condemned for *Heresie*. And this is no other than what

Baron. An. 794.

what Mr. *Thorndike* answers to two Objections urged from St. *Epiphanius* and the Council of *Elvira*, that *granting they held all Images in Churches dangerous for Idolatry* (of *which*, saith he, *there is appearance*) *it is manifest they were afterwards admitted all over.* From whence it follows that what Dr. *St.* argues from the *Synod* of *Paris* under *Ludovicus Pius* (which was indeed but a Conference of some Learned Men) *condemning Pope Adrian for a superstitious adoration of Images*; From the Doctrine also of the Author of the *Caroline Book*, and that of *Agobardus*, which *Baluzius*, saith he, *confesseth to be no more than the whole Gallican Church believed in that Age*, is *no advantage* at all to his Cause, because in supposition that they then did look upon the very true *Doctrine* of the Council of *Nice*, as dangerous, and impugn it as such, by reason of a *very evil superstition*, the same *Baluzius* saith, *had possessed the minds of some persons in that Age*, viz. *that the same Worship was to be given to Images as to the Blessed Trinity*; yet afterwards the Doctrine of the said *Nicene Council* prevailed all over, and was received as an *Apostolical Tradition* by the *Gallican Church* it self; like as the *Doctrine of Non-rebaptization* of Heretics was *Just Wright, chap. 19.*

received in the *African Church*, although it had been condemned *there* before in a Council by St. *Cyprian*. But upon a diligent ſurvey of *Baluzius* his Diſcourſe in that place, I do not perceive his meaning to be what the *Doctor* would have it, viz. that *what Agobardus wrote was the belief of the whole Gallican Church in that Age*: but that it was the *Judgment* and Deſign of the *French Biſhops* at that time, to extirpate by all means the above-mentioned *Superſtition* which then reigned, although in doing it they might ſeem to run into the other extream, of denying *any Worſhip* at all to be due to *Images*; *all the whole buſineſs of the uſe of Images*, *being* (as the Author of the Account very well obſerves, p. 18.) *but a matter of Diſcipline and Government*. For had he meant that *what Agobardus wrote*, *was no more than the whole Gallican Church believed in that Age*; how could the ſame *Baluzius* tell us, that the *French Biſhops* at that time, although they *ſeemed* to remove *all Worſhip* from Images, yet *allowed them to be kept*, *that the Faithful by ſeeing them*, *might be excited to imitate thoſe Holy Perſons they repreſented*: Whereas *Agobardus* went ſo far as to affirm that *they were kept for Ornamen:*

Baluzius in notis ad Agobard. tit. de Imag. p. 88.

Papyrius Maſſon. in Synopſi Agob.

ment to delight the eyes, but not for the inſtruction of the people; nay, that *they were not to be painted upon the Church-Walls*? Was this the *Belief* of the *Gallican Church in that Age*, when *Jonas Aurelianenſis* was commanded by *Ludovicus Pius* to write againſt *Claudius Taurinenſis* for caſting them out of the Church? Surely the little care there was taken to preſerve the *Canon* of the Council of *Francford* againſt *Image-Worſhip*, or rather the unanimous concurrence to ſuppreſs it (if there were ever any ſuch *Canon*, for it lay in obſcurity for above ſeven hundred years together, till it was publiſhed, as my Adverſary ſays, about the middle of the laſt Century, by *Du Tillet*) as alſo the prevalency of the *contrary Belief* in the *Gallican Church*, as it is at this day, without any *noiſe* or *oppoſition*, are no great Preſumptions to men who have any inſight into the Affairs of Religion, that the ſaid *Church* in that Age believed (as Dr. *St.* would have us believe from the Confeſſion of *Baluzius*) that *no Veneration was to be given to Holy Images*. It is upon the contrary ſuppoſition, that *Baluzius* endeavours to excuſe *Agobardus* and ſome other *French Biſhops* of that Age, as tranſported with zeal againſt a Superſtition which, he ſays, had then prevailed among ſome Perſons in giving the ſame Worſhip to Images as to the Holy Trinity. And for himſelf, he profeſſes that

he is much pleaſed with the Decree of the Council of *Cambray*, Anno 1565. That *the People be taught that no Worſhip ought to be given to an Image, for the matter or elegancy of the work, &c. but for the Thing repreſented by it, to which the Worſhip and Honour is chiefly referr'd; and that the Mind or Intention of him that prayeth or worſhippeth be carried to the thing ſignified, and not terminated on the ſign, which can neither hear, nor ſee, nor underſtand.* Thus much to the Doctors Objection from the Council of *Francford*, a Paſſage (take it which way you will) ſo difficult and obſcure, by reaſon of the various Opinions of Authors, and *ſeeming*, if not *real* Contradictions in *Hiſtorians*, that for one whoſe deſign is to blunder, not ſatisfie his Reader, a fitter *Topick* cannot be found, unleſs it be that which follows of the *Calves*, as he hath perplex'd it with his groundleſs Conjectures.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Doctors Third Proof, from the Judgment, as he pretends, of the Law-giver. His ſpeculation concerning the Golden Calves manifeſtly repugnant to the H. Scriptures and Fathers. Mr. Thorndike's Judgment of the Meaning and Extent of the Second Commandment.

§. 1. THe *Third* Reaſon Dr. *Stillingfleet* brings to prove that *God in the ſecond Commandment hath expreſly prohibited the giving any Worſhip to himſelf by an Image*, is taken, ſaith he, (p. 92.) *from thoſe who were beſt able to underſtand the meaning of it:* and among theſe, *none ſo competent a Judge as the Law-giver himſelf.* Here we have a ſolid Principle indeed to work upon, and if the Doctor would give me leave to infer from it, I would argue thus: But the *Law-giver* himſelf commanded the *Ark* and the *Cherubims* to be placed in the Temple, with reſpect to his Worſhip; Therefore *he did not expreſly prohibit in the ſecond Commandment the giving any Worſhip to himſelf by an Image.* For it cannot be conceived that himſelf would introduce and allow

low ſuch a practiſe as ſhould be contrary to its meaning. But I muſt not foreſtall, but attend my Adverſary: and the ſubſtance of what he diſcourſes upon that Principle, is this, That *the Iſraelites were condemned by God of Idolatry, for worſhipping the Golden Calf, and yet they did not fall into the Heathen Idolatry by ſo doing, but onely worſhipped the true God under that Symbol of his preſence.* If you ask him how he knows for certain that *the Iſraelites did not fall back into the Heathen Idolatry*; when it is certain that in *Ægypt* they worſhipped the *Idols* of the *Ægyptians*, *Ezek.*20.7,8? He tells you upon his word, that *they had not the leaſt pretence of infidelity as to the true God*; and yet the very Text he cites to prove it, tells us they pretended their deſpair of *Moſes* returning, as a ſufficient reaſon to move *Aaron* to *make them Gods who ſhould go before them.* If you ask him how he knows for certain, that the *Calf* was intended *to be onely a Symbol of Gods preſence?* He tells you, *We* (that is himſelf and his Maſter *Calvin*) *cannot imagine the people ſo ſottiſh*, Nec tam incogitantes erant Judæi, *ſaith* Calvin, *to deſire Aaron to make them a God in the proper ſence, as though they could believe the Calf newly made, to have been the God, which before it was made, brought them out of the land of*

*Calv. Inſtit. li.*1. *c.*11. *n.*9.

Egypt. And yet they can both of them very eaſily imagine *Catholick Chriſtians* to be ſo ſottiſh as to terminate their Worſhip upon a Block, or a hewn Stone, though at the ſame time they deny *any Divinity* to be in them, or *have not the leaſt preſence of Infidelity as to the True God.* But (be their *Imagination* as much at the *devotion* of their *Paſſion* as they pleaſe) could not the People, *taking it for granted* (as he ſays they did) *that Moſes was not to be heard of more*, fall into a diſlike or a diſtruſt of the God whom *Moſes* had taught them to worſhip, and ſo run with their thoughts into *Ægypt*, and require of *Aaron* to make them *a God to go before them*, like unto the *Gods* which they had ſeen and worſhipped there? That this was their Intention, and not to make a *Symbol onely of the preſence of the true God*, the very *making* of the *Calf*, which was done in imitation of the *Golden Bulls of Ægypt*, the *Symbols* (as the Doctor calls them) *of their chief God Oſiris*, ſufficiently evinces. And for this it is they are ſo frequently reprehended in Holy Scripture. *Deut.*xxxii.15. *He* (that is, *Iſrael*) *forſook God which made him, and went back from the God of his Salvation*; and verſ. 18. *Thou haſt forſaken the God which made thee, and haſt forgotten the God thy Creator.* Pſal.cv.19. *They made a Calf in Horeb, and worſhipped the Molten Image; Thus they changed*

ged their Glory into the ſimilitude of an Ox that eateth Graſs. They forgat God who had ſaved them, who had done ſo great things in Ægypt, wonderous works in the Land of Cham, and fearful things in the red Sea. And again, Acts vii. 39, 40. Our Fathers, ſaith St. Stephen, would not obey, but thruſt him (that is, the true God) from them, and in their hearts turned back again into Ægypt, ſaying unto Aaron, Make us Gods to go before us, &c. And they made a Calf in thoſe days, and offered ſacrifice to the Idol, and rejoyced in the work of their own hands. This is what the Scripture teſtifieth that the *Iſraelites* did, viz. *that they forgat the God which made them; that they thruſt him from them, and in their hearts turned back into Ægypt*; that the *Molten Calf* (which they had made after the pattern they had ſeen there) *was an Idol, and that they offered ſacrifices to this Idol*: And muſt we now deny all this to be true, becauſe *Calvin* and Dr. *St. cannot imagine the People to have been ſo ſottiſh?* Is this to make *Scripture* the *Rule* of *Faith*, or *Imagination* to be the *Rule* of *Scripture?* Let the Reader obſerve here for his Inſtruction that according to Dr. *St.*'s behaviour here and elſewhere, if he meet with any paſſage in *Scripture* that thwarts his *Imagination*, he muſt underſtand it in a ſenſe agreeable to what he *can* imagine, that is, as beſt pleaſes his own fancy. And This

(how

(how cunningly ſoever He and his Partizans diſguiſe it) is indeed the onely Ground from which they take their meaſures in the *Interpretation* of *Scripture*, as Mr. *E. W.* hath clearly proved in his Book called *Proteſtancy without Principles*. And although *His performance*, among others, be likened by the Doctor to the *way that Rats anſwer Books, by gnawing ſome of the leaves of them:* yet an Impartial Reader will compare it rather to the *execution* done by the *Worm* in *Jonas*, which *ſmote the Gourd, and it withered*. But to return to the *Iſraelites*, and their *Golden Calf*.

§. 2. Did the Fathers underſtand the ſame by it which *Calvin* and the *Doctor* do? Could *They* not imagine the People to be ſo *ſottiſh* as to aſcribe their deliverance, and the Miracles wrought in it, to this *New God?* Nothing leſs. *There is no cauſe to wonder*, ſaith St. *Athanaſius*, *at the Phariſees madneſs, in imputing the works of Chriſt to the Devil, becauſe their Fathers were of the ſame mind before them; for being but newly gone out of Egypt, they attributed the benefits which God had beſtowed on them, to the Calf which themſelves had made, ſaying, Theſe are thy Gods, O Iſrael, which brought thee out of Egypt. You will ask*, ſaith St. *Hierom*, *how they*

S. Athan. in illud, Quicunq; dixerit verbum. Tom. 4.

they offered ſacrifices in the Wilderneſs not to God, but to their King, whom they call Lucifer? And the Anſwer he gives is, that *from the time they transformed their Gold into a Calf, ſaying theſe are thy Gods, O Iſrael, which brought thee out of Egypt, it is manifeſt, that all what they did, they did not to God, but to Idols.* In like manner St. *Chryſoſtom. After the people had heard thoſe words, I am the Lord thy God, Thou ſhalt have no other Gods beſide me; They made a Calf, and rejected God. They did not acknowledge him to be the Lord, but diſowned their Benefactor, ſaying unto Aaron, Make us Gods to go before us!* And then, as if he had foreſeen the difficulty *Calvin* and my Adverſary have of imagining how *the people could believe the Calf newly made to have been the God, which before it was made brought them out of the Land of Egypt,* He objects to himſelf, *If they were Gods, why did they ſay, Make? For how can thoſe be Gods which are made?* And then anſwers, *Sic malitia obſæcans ſibi ipſi repugnat, & ſemetipſam extinguit.* That, *It is the nature of malice to blind the mind it poſſeſſes to that degree, that it makes it contradict and deſtroy it ſelf.*

St. Hierom in Amos, cap. 5.

St. Chryſoſt. Tom. 5. Hom. 5. de Pœnit.

§. 3. This

§. 3. This is what the *Holy Scripture* and the *Fathers* say expressly of the *Israelites* making and worshipping the *Calf*. That they were *Idolaters* in so doing, we confess; but that their *Idolatry* consisted onely in worshipping the *True God* under *that*, as a *Symbol* of his presence, we utterly deny. And till the Doctor can prove it, by as great, if not greater Authority of *Scriptures* and *Fathers*, than I have done the contrary, he will never prove from this fact of theirs, that *God hath expressly prohibited in the second Commandment the giving him any Worship by an Image*. What he does is, to tell us that he cannot *imagine the people to have been so sottish, as to believe the Calf newly made to have been the God, which before it was made, brought them out of the Land of Egypt: or to think the Gods of Egypt had wrought those Miracles for them in their deliverance*. But these are Conjectures of his own Fancy, without any *Authority* of *Scripture* or *Fathers*; nay expressly against them, as I have shewed. And although *Aaron* perhaps, and some of the Wiser among them might not be *so sottish*, yet it is certain (as the Doctor confesses of his *Wiser Heathens*) they were *so weak* as *to concur with them in the external practises of their Idolatry*. But then he tells us again, (p. 94.) that the *people took it for granted that Moses, by reason of his forty days absence, was to*

be

be heard of no more; and therefore they fell upon deviſing the fitteſt Symbol for the preſence of God going before them; and herein the greateſt number, ſaith he, *being poſſeſſed with the prejudices of their Education in Egypt, where Golden Bulls were the Symbols of their chief God Oſiris, they pitched upon that, and forced Aaron to a compliance with them in it.* And all the proof he brings for this, is, that immediately before *Moſes* his going up to the Mount, the laſt Promiſe God made to them was, that *he would ſend his Angel before them*, Exod.xxiii.20,23. as if thoſe who had *forgotten the God that made them*, could not alſo *forget* this *Promiſe*; or at leaſt think that *He* had *forgotten* it, or was not able to perform it; and ſo fall upon deviſing the *making of a God* like thoſe they had ſeen in *Egypt*, whoſe Preſence and Conduct they might have continually with them. This follows much more clearly from the *prejudice of their Education in Egypt*, than what the Doctor has *deviſed* for them; for they never deviſed any ſuch thing to themſelves, as is manifeſt out of the *Scriptures* and *Fathers* before alledged. And when I conſider the *Iſraelites*, a people without Learning, oppreſſed for four hundred years together by the moſt Idolatrous Nation in the World, and ſerving *their Gods*, as it appears they did, out of *Ezek.xx.* 8. the prejudice which this cuſtom had wrought

wrought in them, and their readineſs upon every ſlight occaſion, to turn back with their hearts into *Egypt*; laſtly, the Character which God himſelf gives of them, *Deut.* xxxii. 28. that *they were a Nation void of counſel, neither was there any underſtanding in them.* When, I ſay, I conſider all this on the one ſide; and the quaint *device* the Doctor would transfer from his own head into theirs, of making the *Calf* onely for the *Symbol of the preſence of the true God*, on the other: I cannot but look upon it to be much of the ſame nature with thoſe ſubtil fetches which *Hiſtorians*, to ſhew their own skill in *Politicks*, deviſe, rather than diſcover, in the Actions of thoſe Perſons (though never ſo ſtupid) who are the ſubject of their Hiſtory. How many Plots and Deſigns have *Tacitus* and others framed for them, which they never dream't of themſelves? much leſs were the *Iſraelites* guilty of any ſuch ſubtil ſpeculation as *Calvin* and the *Doctor* have invented for them. The higheſt pitch of their Fancy, if it ſtaid not in the Image it ſelf, was to imagine ſome *Deity*, like thoſe of *Egypt*, to inſinuate it ſelf into the Calf (as the *Egyptians* believed of *their Gods*) from thence to give *Oracles*, and conduct them into the *Land* of *Promiſe*; and not as the Doctor deviſes for them, that they look'd upon it onely as a *Symbol* of the *true God*,

whom now they had thruſt from them and for-gotten. To make out this device, which had no other foundation but in his own fancie, he is forc'd to invent a *new kind* of Idolatry, *diſtinct from the Heathen Idolatry*; Becauſe *there is no intimation* (ſaith he, p.95.) *made of their falling into the Heathen Idolatry.* But why then does he charge the *Church* of *Rome* with *Idolatry* upon this account, (p.3.) *viz.* that *ſhe requires the giving to the Creature the Worſhip due onely to the Creator?* Is not the giving *Divine Worſhip* to a *Creature*, the *ſame* as to make it a *falſe God?* And is it not *Heathen Idolatry* to worſhip a *falſe God?* Either then he muſt *retract* the ground upon which he builds his Charge of *Idolatry*; or he muſt ſtand to it ſtifly without flinching, that both *Catholicks* now, and the *Jews* then were *Heathen Idolaters.* For he does but contradict himſelf whilſt he makes us guilty onely of *Chriſtian Idolatry*; and yet does us no kindneſs at all, whilſt he charges us to *terminate* the Worſhip due onely to *God*, upon the *Creature.* Oh, but, ſays he, *when afterwards the Iſraelites fell into Heathen Idolatry, the particular names of the Gods are mentioned, as Baal-Peor, Moloch, Remphan*, &c. What then? Is it the *Idol*'s having a Name, that makes the Worſhippers *Heathen Idolaters?* *Ariſtotle* tells us, that *words are but the ſigns of the conceptions of our mind:* and if they

they conceived or believed the *Calf* to be a *God*, were they not as much *Heathen Idolaters* for worſhipping *it* without a Name, as the *Egyptians* for worſhipping it under the Name of *Apis?* The onely difference I find is, that the *Egyptians* by long practice were become *Maſters* of their *Trade*, in making *Gods*, whereas the *Iſraelites* by this one Act were *Novices* onely in that *Art*.

§. 4. What hath been ſaid of the Golden *Calf* in the Wilderneſs, may in like manner be applied to the Calves which *Jeroboam* ſet up at *Dan* and *Bethel*, viz. that the People did not look upon them as *Symbols* onely of the preſence of the *true God*, but that, as St. *Hierom* ſaith, *they forgat the Law of God, and wholly devoted themſelves to Egyptian Idols.* And the ſame is affirmed by the Author of the Commentaries under the name of St. *Ambroſe*, viz. *that the Egyptians worſhipped a four-footed Beaſt, whom they called Apis, in the likeneſs of a Calf: Which* Evil *of theirs*, ſaith he, *was imitated by Jeroboam, in ſetting up the Calves in Samaria, to which the Jews offered ſacrifice. But this*, ſaith the Doctor, *was not ſo agreeable to his End, nor ſo likely to ſucceed:* And why not? Was not *his end* to ſecure the *Ten Tribes* to himſelf, ſo that they

S. Hierom in Oſee, c.4.

S. Ambr. in Rom.1.Tom.3

might not think of returning to unite themſelves any more to the Houſe of *David?* And what more likely way to effect it, than the making them ſuch *Idols* as their *Fathers* had worſhipped in *Egypt* and the *Wilderneſs?* What he aimed at, (*Achitophel*-like) was to make the breach irreconcilable, and *this* of making them *Calves* he look'd upon as the propereſt means to that end, conſidering the inclination of that People, *whoſe eyes*, as the Scripture ſaith, *were after their Fathers Idols.* I, but *the Occaſion*, ſaith he, *of the Kingdoms coming to him, was from Solomon's falling into Heathen Idolatry, and this would make him more cautious of falling into it, eſpecially at his firſt entrance.* And I believe it would have done ſo, had he been a *Good Joſias*, and not a *wicked Jeroboam.* But why the *Doctor* ſhould think *him* ſo *tender conſcienc'd*, whom God himſelf upbraids for *having made to himſelf ſtrange and molten Gods, and caſt him behind his back*, 3 Kings xiv. 9. Or why he ſhould think him ſo ſcrupulous, when the Scripture ſaith, that *he ſacrificed to the Gods which he had made*, 3 Kings xii. 32. *and that he ordained him Prieſts for the high places, and for the Devils, and for the Calves which he had made*, 2 Paralip. xi. 15. I cannot imagine. The Ingenious Author of *the Cauſes of the decay of Chriſtian Piety*, chap. 15. made a different

Ezek. xx. 24.

ferent Judgment of the matter, when to ſhew that *Divinity has long ſince been made the Handmaid to Policy, and Religion modell'd by Conveniencies of State*; he immediately adds for an example, that *The Golden Calves became venerable Deities, when they were found apt to ſecure Jeroboam's jealouſies.* But had this been *Jeroboam's* Intention, *how much better*, ſaith the Doctor, *had he then argued that they had been hitherto in a great miſtake concerning the true God, and not meerly as to the place of his Worſhip, which is all he ſpeaks againſt; for he continued*, ſaith he, *the ſame Feaſts and way of Worſhip which were at Jeruſalem?* 1 Kings xii. 32. And what wonder if ſo great a *Polititian* as he was, judg'd it not fit to leave off on the ſudden all that had been in uſe before? Sudden Changes from one extream to another, whether in the *Natural* or *Politick* Body, are always look'd upon as dangerous. And therefore the firſt *Reformers* here in *England*, when they deſign'd a Service onely of Bread and Wine, thought it expedient to retain the Names of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, and many of the ancient Prayers and Ceremonies, which the nicer Brethren boggle at at this day, as *Relicks* of *Popery*, and *Politick* Inventions to make the *Bread* and *Wine* go down the better. But for *Jeroboam*, he told the People plain enough what he meant, when pointing

to the *Calves*, he bid them *behold the Gods which had brought them up out of the Land of Egypt.* And the Text cited by the Doctor 1*Reg.* xii. 23. ſpeaks but of *one Feaſt he ordain'd like unto the Feaſt that was in Juda*; though the Doctor will have it, that *he continued the ſame Feaſts and way of Worſhip which were at Jeruſalem.* But *Ahab*'s ſin, he ſaith, was much greater than that of *Jeroboam:* It was ſo; but will abſolve *Jeroboam* no more from the guilt of *Idolatry*, (which the Scripture calls *ſpiritual Adultery*) than one mans committing *adultery* with *many*, will free another from the guilt of the ſame crime, who commits it but with *one*: Nor does *Jehu*'s *zeal for the Lord* (nay though it were for *his Lord*, as the Doctor, not the Scripture, reads it) exempt *him* from *Idolatry* in following the ſteps of *Jeroboam*, any more than the *lawful Act* of *Matrimony* acquits a Husband from the Crime of *Adultery*, who defiles his Neighbours Bed. But, *How then*, ſaith he, *came the Worſhip of the true God in the ten Tribes to be ſet in oppoſition to the Heathen Idolatry in* 1 Kings xviii. 21 *?* No otherwiſe ſurely than by the force of imagination. For when *Elias* ſaid unto the people, *How long will ye halt between two Opinions? If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him.* The ſence is plain, that he meant to recal the people to the Worſhip of the onely True God, whom

2 *Kings* x. 16.

whom he preached to them, and in the manner he himſelf did worſhip him; and not that he intended to ſet the *Iſraelites* ſacrificing to the *Calves* at *Dan* and *Bethel* (which is what the Doctor means by *the Worſhip of the true* God *in the ten Tribes*) in oppoſition to the Worſhip of *Baal*. For in the very next Chapter the Prophet himſelf ſuppoſes ſuch a general *Apoſtacy* of the *ten Tribes* to the Worſhip of *Baal*, that he complains as if he alone were left alive, who had not conſented to his Worſhip; as appears by the Anſwer which God made him, that *he had yet ſeven thouſand left in Iſrael which had not bowed their knees to Baal*, 3 Kings xix. 17, 18. How then could *Elias* ſet the *Worſhip of the true* God *in the ten Tribes* in oppoſition to the Worſhip of *Baal*, when he ſuppoſed all that were remaining of the Ten Tribes, except himſelf, to have forſaken the true God to follow *Baal*? As for the Embaſſy of the *Samaritans* to the King of *Aſſyria*, *that a Prieſt might be ſent unto them from the Captivity*, the reaſon is plain why they ſent to him, and not to the King of *Juda*, becauſe they fear'd his diſpleaſure, ſhould they have kept Correſpondence with his Enemy. Moreover they thought the God of *Iſrael* to be only a *Topical* God; and therfore they call him *the* God *of the Land*, 4 Kings xvii. 26. as diſtinct from *the* God *of Juda*. Now what

the Text ſaith, is, that the Prieſt when he came, *taught them how they ſhould fear the Lord*; but there is no mention at all made of his teaching them to *worſhip him in the Calves*, as *Symbols of his preſence*, which was the *onely thing* for the Doctors purpoſe, had it been there.

§. 5. Having thus anſwer'd all the *Doctors* Conjectures, or rather *Monceius* his, as to the greater part of them, (for it is with *his Heifer he plows*) by which he endeavours to make the World believe that the *Iſraelites* intended the making of the *Calves* for no other end, but onely to worſhip God in them as *Symbols of his preſence*, and ſhewn them to be perfectly groundleſs; for a farther diſcovery of the weakneſs of his Diſcourſe, let us ſuppoſe it, after all, to be as he would have it; It cannot be denied, but the *Calves* were originally *Symbols* of *Oſirin*, the chief (but *falſe*) God of the *Egyptians*; and himſelf confeſſes (p. 94.) that upon this account the *Iſraelites* made choice of them for the *fitteſt Symbols* of the preſence of the true God: Suppoſe, I ſay, they look'd upon them as *ſuch*, and that they were condemned of *Idolatry* for intending to worſhip the *true* God in them, I affirm, it follows no more from hence, that God *hath expreſly prohibited in the ſecond Commandment to give him any Worſhip by ſuch Symbols or Images as*

are

are not *the Symbols of falſe Gods*; than it would follow from a King's condemning ſuch Perſons of *Treaſon*, as ſhould pretend to wo:ſhip *Him* by honouring the *Image* of an *Uſurper*, that he had expreſly prohibited the giving him any *Worſhip* by his *own Image*. In fine, if this diſcourſe of the Doctors may be allowed for good, I ſee no reaſon why he might not as well juſtifie the groſſeſt of *Idolaters*, the *Ægyptians*, in their worſhip of *Leeks and Onyons*, from the guilt of *Heathen Idolatry*, as the *Iſraelites* in worſhipping the *Calves*: for, proceeding in his way, it were but to imagin, they could not be *ſo ſottiſh* as to believe *them* to be *Gods in the proper ſenſe*, but that they look'd upon them *onely* as *Symbols* of *Gods kindneſs to them*, in providing them *Sauce* as well as *Meat*, though out of *Reverence* to thoſe Deities they would eat neither of them.

§. 6. To conclude this Point of the *meaning* of the *Second Commandment*, he tells us, that the *Jews thought the Prohibition to extend to all kind of Images for Worſhip*. And I would gladly know whether we muſt *ſtand* or *fall* by the Interpretation of the *Jews*? It was their Opinion that the Prohibition extended not only to the *worſhipping*, but alſo to the *making* all kind of *Images*. And will the Doctor there-

Vaſq. in 3. d. Th. diſp. 103. q. 25. c. 1.

fore

fore condemn the Professions of *Painting* and *Carving*, as *unlawful*, and (as his Constantinopolitan Fathers call them) *blasphemous?* Well, but *Vasquez*, saith he, acknowledgeth, with other *Divines* of the *Roman Church*, that *it is plain in Scripture, that God did not only forbid that in the second Commandment which was unlawful by the Law of Nature, as the worshipping an Image for God; but the worshipping the true God by any similitude of him*: But to whom do they say he forbids it? Does not *Vasquez* say expressly, *c.* 2. that it was to the *Jews?* which the Doctor conveniently leaves out. And do not those *Divines* in the very words cited by himself plainly declare the Prohibition of *worshipping God by any similitude of him*, to be but a *Positive* Precept, when they so clearly distinguish it from the Prohibition of *worshipping an Image for God*, which they say, *was unlawful by the Light of Nature?* And if they look'd upon that part of the Prohibition as a *meer Positive Precept*, does he think they thought it obliged *Christians?* Their Doctrine and Practice evince the contrary. And if *Divines* agree not among themselves how far this Precept obliged the *Jews*, what matter is it, so they agree that what is forbidden in it to *Christians*

Conc. Nicen. Act. 6.

Vasq. in 3. *d. Th. disp.* 104. *q.* 25. *c.* 3.

is

is that *which is unlawful by the Law of Nature?* The oppoſition then which the Doctor would make between *my* Aſſertion, and that of other *Catholick Divines*, is altogether impertinent; for taking it as a *Natural* Precept and *Immutable*, they ſay the ſame that I do, that *it onely forbids the worſhipping of Idols.* To what he alledges of the *Primitive Chriſtians being declared Enemies to all Worſhip of God by Images*, which, he ſaith, is at laſt confeſſed by *Petavius*, one of the moſt Learned *Jeſuites* they ever had, when he affirms, that *for the firſt four Centuries, or farther, there was little or no uſe of Images in the Temples or Oratories of Chriſtians*, (not to diſpute the matter of fact, of which he confeſſes there was ſome *little uſe*; nor the truth of the *Doctors* relating the words of *Petavius*, of which there is ſome *little* reaſon to doubt, from what he did before with *Trigautius*) I ſhall give him the Anſwer of Mr. *Thorndike*, one of the moſt Learned *Divines* among the *Proteſtants*, that *at that time there might be jealouſie of Offence in having Images in Churches, before Idolatry was quite rooted out, of which afterwards there might be no appearance. And there-*

Petav. Dogm. Theolog. Tom. 5. lib. 15. c. 13. ſ. 3. c. 14. 5, 8.

Juſt Weights, chap. 19.

therefore they were afterwards admitted all over; for it is manifeſt, ſaith he, *the Church is tied no farther than there can appear danger of Idolatry.* And ſince he hath given in occaſion to mention this Learned Perſon, I ſhall conclude this Point with *his Judgment* concerning the *meaning* and *extent* of the Second Commandment, that the Reader may ſee how diametrically oppoſite Dr. *St.*'s diſcourſe is, to the Sentiment of ſo Eminent a *Divine* in the *Church of England.* Thus then Mr. *Thorndike.*

§. 5. "The ſecond Commandment, ſetting "forth God for a God that is jealous of his "People whether they wor- "ſhip him or not, mani- "feſtly ſuppoſeth their Co- "venant to forſake all other "Gods beſide him: a Contract of Mar- "riage between Him and his People. "Which if it be ſo, it is no leſs mani- "feſt, that the Images which the Precept "ſuppoſeth, are the Repreſentations of "other Gods, which his People were "wont to commit Adultery with, by "Worſhipping them for God. For ſee- "ing it is manifeſt how much Idolatry "was advanced by Imagery, (though it "may be without it) there can be no "marvel that there ſhould be a peculiar

Juſt Weights, chap. 23.

"Pre-

"Precept against it. Wherefore it is ma-
"nifeſt that *Jews* by the Letter of this
"Precept are tied from *all Images* which
"their Elders, who had the power of li-
"miting what is lawful, and what is not
"by the Law, ſhould declare to be un-
"lawful: But to think that their decla-
"rations ought to bind *Chriſtians*, were
"to imagine that *Chriſtians* ought to be
"*Jews*.——And then a little after, he goes
on. "For Chriſtianity, ſaith he, having
"put Idolatry to flight, which the Law
"never pretended to do, it is not to be
"imagined, that the having of Images
"can make a man take thoſe for God,
"which they repreſent, ſo long as the be-
"lief of Chriſtianity is alive at the heart.
"For neither was it Idolatry, though it
"were a breach of this Commandment,
"for a Jew to have ſuch Images as were
"forbidden by their Elders, not taking
"that for God which they repreſented.
"But what honour of Saints departed,
"or what ſigns of that honour, Chriſti-
"anity may require, what Furniture or
"Ceremonies the Churches of Chriſti-
"ans, and the Publick Worſhip of God
"in them, may require, now all the world
"profeſſes Chriſtianity, and muſt honour
"the Religion which they profeſs, this
"the Church is at freedom to determine

"by

" by the Word of God, expounded ac-
" cording to the beſt agreement of Chri-
" ſtians.

This is Mr. *Thorndike*'s Diſcourſe, in which the Reader may obſerve,

1. That to think the Declarations of the *Jews* ought to bind *Chriſtians*, were to imagine that *Chriſtians* ought to be *Jews*.

2. That all things forbidden to the *Jews* by this Commandment, were *Not Idolatry*.

3. That the Images which the Precept ſuppoſeth, were the *Repreſentations* of *other*, that is, *falſe Gods*, which his People were wont to *worſhip* for *God*.

4. That *what Furniture* (viz. of Images, the matter he there treats of) *or Ceremonies the Publick Worſhip of God may require, is left to the Judgment of the Church to determine.*

5. and laſtly, That the Oppoſition in this Point between Dr. *St.* and Mr. *Thorndike*, is not onely concerning the obligation of the *Jews* (as between *Catholick Divines*) but of *Chriſtians* alſo, in order to this Commandment. So that ſome are of opinion, however Dr. *St.* ſeem to *direct* his arrows againſt the *Church* of *Rome*, yet he meant at leaſt by rebound to *ſhoot* them at Mr. *Thorndike*. And had he made it any part of his buſineſs to *anſwer* his Arguments, I might eaſily have been

been induc'd to have embrac'd their Opinion. But thoſe remaining untouch'd, I cannot but look upon this Diſcourſe of that *Learned Perſon*, as a kind of *Prophetical Confutation* in the year 1662. (when he printed that Book) of all which Dr. *Stillingfleet* brings in 1671. for the proof of his *Charge* of *Idolatry* againſt the *Church* of *Rome* in the matter of Images. As for his *new way* of anſwering the Teſtimony I alledged of St. *Auſtin's* Judgment (of the ſenſe of this Commandment) by asking me *how I am ſure that it was his conſtant Judgment*, I have at large refuted it in the Third Chapter, to which I remit the Reader.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

What kind of Honour the Church gives to Holy Images, explained: and the Doctors mixing School-Disputes with matters of Faith, shewn to be sophistical.

§. 1. TO clear the *Doctrine* and *Practise* of the *Catholick Church* from his most Unjust Charge of *Idolatry*, I told the Reader, That *the Honour we give to the Sacred Images of Christ and his Saints, was an inferiour or Relative Honour onely, not Latria, the Worship due to God, but a certain Honourary Worship, expressed by kissing them, or putting off our Hats, or kneeling before them: much like the Worship which is given to the Chair of State, or the Reverence which Moses and Joshua gave to the Ground, by putting off their Shoes*, &c. That this was the meaning of the *Council* of *Nice*, is confessed by Dr. *Field* and Mr. *Thorndike*, as I have shewed p. 124. And that the *Council* of *Trent* means no more, is manifest from the words of the *Council* related above, Chap. 2. as also for that *Sess.* 25. it refers us expressly to the *Council* of *Nice*. Yet because the

Of the Church, l. 3. c. 36.

the *Doctor* is reſolved to quarrel the diſtinction of *Abſolute* and *Relative* Worſhip, that the Reader may ſee what is meant by it, I ſhall deſire him to take notice, firſt, That *Adoration* or Worſhip being an *Act* of the *Will*; as the *Will* can *love* one thing *for it ſelf*, becauſe of the Perfection it is endow'd with, and another thing not for it ſelf, but purely for that *others ſake* to whom it belongs. So likewiſe it may *adore* or *worſhip* a thing, either *for it ſelf*, that is, for ſome intrinſecal Excellency in the thing, for which it deſerves Worſhip; and then it is ſaid to *worſhip* the thing *abſolutely*, becauſe for it ſelf. Or it may *worſhip* it for *another's ſake*, that is, for ſome Excellency in the Perſon to whom the ſaid thing hath a *Relation* or *Union*: and then it is ſaid to worſhip ſuch a thing with a *Relative* or *Inferiour* Worſhip, becauſe purely for that Perſons ſake. And becauſe *Intellectual Beings* are capable of having ſome *Excellency* in themſelves, for which they deſerve to be worſhipped, as *Virtue*, *Sanctity*, *Wiſdom*, *Power*, &c. and *Inanimate Beings* are capable of bearing a *Relation* to a Perſon endowed with ſuch Excellencies, it follows that as *Intellectual Beings* may have *Abſolute* Worſhip given to them; ſo *Inanimate Things* relating to them, may for their ſakes have a *Relative* Reſpect, or *Honourary Adoration* given to them; and

that ſo far from being *injurious* to the Perſon to whom they belong, that it would be look'd upon as a *diſreſpect* and *affront*, if in due circumſtances it were not done. Such a kind of *Relative Worſhip* it is we affirm to be *due*, and to be *given* to the *Images* of *Chriſt* and his *Saints*, when we *kiſs* them, or put off our *Hats* before them. Secondly, I muſt deſire him to obſerve (as Mr. *Thorndike* doth very well) that the words *Adoration*, *Worſhip*, *Reſpect*, *Reverence*, *or howſoever you tranſlate the Latine word* Cultus, *are or may be in deſpite of our hearts equivocal*; that is, ſometimes they may ſignifie one kind of honour, and ſometimes another: Sometimes that which belongs to *God*, and ſometimes that which belongs to the *Creature*. And the *cauſe of this equivocation*, he ſaith, *is, the want of words; vulgar uſe not having provided words properly to ſignifie conceptions which came not from common ſenſe*. And from this equivocation in the Words *Adoration*, *Worſhip*, *&c.* the greateſt part of the Difficulties which occur in this, take their riſe. Now when the Doctor ſhould ſet himſelf ſeriouſly to confute the aforeſaid Explication, he puts his Reader into a fit of laughing with a *Drolliſh Parallel*, p. 100. that to give this *Inferiour* and *Relative* kind of Worſhip to the *Image* of *Chriſt*, that is, to honour and

Epiſ. p. 3. *p.* 353.

reve-

reverence *it* for *his ſake*, is *juſt as if an unchaſte Wife ſhould plead in her excuſe to her Husband, that the perſon ſhe was too kind with, was extreamly like him, and a near friend of his, and that it was out of reſpect to him that ſhe gave him the honour of his Bed.* But to lay open the *unparallell'd* fondneſs of this Compariſon, there needs no more than to appeal to any married man for his Opinion in the caſe, viz: Whether he think it a matter of like Reſentment to find his *Wife* kiſſing his *Picture* as it hangs at her Breaſt, as to ſurprize her in Bed with a *Friend* of his, though never ſo like him? Some things done out of reſpect are very *well* taken, and cannot in reaſon be otherwiſe, by the Perſon for whoſe ſake the reſpect is given; of this kind I take the *wearing* of her Husbands *Picture* to be in a Wife, or her being *kind* (though not *too kind*) to his *Friend* for his ſake. But others there are, which would be very *ill* taken, though pretended to be done with never ſo much reſpect: And of this kind I ſuppoſe it would be, to *give the Honour of her Husbands Bed* to another, though never ſo *like* him. No man ſurely well in his Senſes, can look upon theſe two with an equal Concern. And yet if the Doctor will make his Compariſon hold good, he muſt prove the whole ſtate of married Mankind *do*, or *ought* to *do* ſo: At leaſt

to infer any thing againſt us, he muſt ſhew it not poſſible to give any Honour or Reſpect (even inferiour) to the *Image* of *Chriſt* for his *ſake*. For if this be poſſible, it will follow, that as in a *Chaſte Wife* it is a laudable expreſſion of the *Honour* and *Reſpect* ſhe bears her *Husband*, to kiſs his *Picture*, or wear it near her Heart; So it will be no leſs in a *Chriſtian* towards *Chriſt*, to give an *Honourary Reſpect* to his *Image* for *his ſake*. *God indeed hath declared himſelf*, as the Doctor ſaith, *particularly jealous of his Honour in this Commandment, that he will not give his Glory to another, but hath reſerved all Divine Worſhip as peculiar to himſelf*; but where hath he declared that we may not teſtifie the giving *Him* Divine Worſhip by *kiſſing* his *Image*, or the *Books* of the H. Goſpels, or other things relating to Him? The *Object* of *Jealouſie* is a *Rival*, or what hath *relation* to, or *union* with *him*; not what may ſerve to expreſs Affection and Reſpect to the *Perſon* who *ought* to be loved: And therefore a *Jealous* Husband will neither permit his Wife to admit his *Rival* into her Company, nor *his Picture* into her Cloſet; yet never thinks her an *Adultereſs* for carrying *his own* in her boſom. The Images which the Precept ſuppoſeth, were as Mr. *Thorndike* ſaith, *the Repreſentations of other Gods, which his people were wont to commit Idolatry with.* And the Doctor,

Doctor, though in the Reply I challeng'd him to do it, neither hath nor can produce any Prohibition of giving to the *Images* of *Christ* and his *Saints* a *relative* Reſpect or Worſhip for his ſake. And in caſe he could, yet that I hope would prove it no more to be *Idolatry* in a Chriſtian to kiſs, for example, the *Image* of *Chriſt crucified*, than it would be *Adultery* in a Wife out of reſpect to her Husband, (though he ſhould forbid it) to kiſs *his Picture*. *Diſobedience* there might be in either caſe, but *Idolatry* or *Adultery* in neither.

§. 2. Having prepared his Reader with ſo *juſt* a Compariſon, and told him *by the by*, of the diſtinction of *Abſolutely and Relatively* being very ſubtilly applied in *Scotland* to ſaying *the Lords Prayer to a Saint*, which in reality needed no ſuch diſtinction, as ſignifying no more, than ſaying the *Pater Noſter* to *God*, with an intention directed to ſuch or ſuch a *Saint*, to deſire him to become *joynt-Petitioner* with us for what we beg in it; He *wonders*, in the next place, (p. 101.) *very much we ſtick at any kind of Worſhip to be done to Images. For his part, were he of our mind, he ſhould as little ſcruple offering up the Hoſt to an Image, as ſaying his prayers to it, and he doubts not to come off with the ſame diſtinctions. For if I do it*, ſaith he, *to God abſolutely and for himſelf, and to the Image onely improperly*

and relatively, wherein am I *to blame?* This is his Diſcourſe, and the Reader may obſerve in it, 1. That he hath not read, or at leaſt takes no notice, that the anſwer in the ordinary *Catholick Catechiſm*, to the Queſtion, Whether we may pray to Images? is a down-right *No*, *by no means*: and that the *Council* of *Trent* Seſſ. 25. hath declared that *we are not to ask any thing of an* Image. Let the Reader judge whether this were ignorance or no. 2. That he cannot contain himſelf any where within bounds of Mediocrity, but muſt always run into extreams, which ſide ſoever he take. He cannot be a *Church-of-England-man*, but with the *Presbyterians* he muſt deny *Epiſcopacy* to be of *Divine Right*, and *any honour* to be *due* to the *Euchariſt* or *Altar*, &c. Neither will he be a *Papiſt* without *offering up the Hoſt and ſaying his prayers to an* Image. So that if He become a *Proſelyte*, He cannot content Himſelf with the *Common Idolatry* of the Papiſts, in kiſſing or putting off their Hats to the *Images of Chriſt*, but will needs make Himſelf *twice a greater Idolater* than they are. How much He would be to blame in ſo doing, He will better underſtand when He is become a *Proſelyte*. In the mean time it may ſuffice Him to know, *that the Church of God hath no ſuch cuſtom*: for however the *material* action of Sacrifice may be done for ſeveral ends and intentions;

tions; yet when it proceeds from an intention to profess a total submission of our selves to *God*, as the Supream Author of *Life* and *Death*, (which gives it the *formality* of a *Sacrifice*) it is used and taken by the *publick Use and Custom of the Church*, for an acknowledgement of the *absolute Worship* due to *God*, and not of *Relative* to an *Image*: and that more especially in offering up the *Host*, that is, the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, the true *Christian* Sacrifice, the Nature and Dignity whereof requireth that it be offered to *God* alone. As for the Rule of St. *Basil*, upon which he would ground *his* Practise (and which I quoted very sincerely, though he craftily insinuate the contrary to the Reader) viz. *That the Worship of the Image is carried to the Prototype*; Mr. *Thorndike* hath told him very well, that *what Signs of Honour or Ceremonies the Publick Worship of God may require, the Church is at freedom to determin*; and so onely such expressions of Honour are to be given to *Images* as the *Church* allows. What therefore I should advise him, were I worthy, and would he be of our mind, should be to lay aside what the Apostle calls *languishing about Questions and strife of Words*, and (as a Modern Author phrases

S. Bas. li. de Spiritu sancto. cap. 18.

1 *Tim.* vi. 4.

it) to uſe *Eccleſiaſtical good manners* to the H. *Images* of *Chriſt* and his *Saints*, and *ſay his prayers* and *offer Sacrifice* (as other *Catholicks* do) to God alone. It is *Duty* and *Diſcretion* in things we *cannot underſtand*, to follow the *Apoſtle's* Rule, *Sapere ad ſobrietatem*, to be wiſe unto ſobriety. But it is no leſs than *inſolency and madneſs*, and *that in the higheſt degree*, ſaith St. *Auſtin*, *to diſpute whether that be to be done or no, which is practiſed by the whole Church through the World*, as this Cuſtom of giving an *Honourary Reſpect to the Images* of *Chriſt* and his *Saints*, hath been confeſſedly for many hundreds of years.

S. Aug. Ep. 118.

§. 3. But before the Doctor can or will become a perfect *Proſelyte* of the *Church* of *Rome*, *he deſires ſeriouſly* (it ſeems he was but (as I gueſs'd) in a fit of Drolling before) *to know of me, whether any Worſhip doth at all belong to the Image, or no? Becauſe*, ſaith he, *if there be any Worſhip due (as the Council of Trent ſaith there is) to the Image, either it is the ſame that is given to the Prototype, or diſtinct from it. If it be the ſame, then proper Divine Worſhip is given to the Image: If diſtinct, then the Image is worſhipped with Divine Worſhip for it ſelf, and not relatively, as I would have it.* And was it not ſubtilly done to tell us, that if the *Worſhip given to an Image*

Image be distinct from that which is given to the Prototype, (God) *then the Image is worshipped with Divine Worship for it self?* The *words* had been more *expreſs*, but the *ſenſe* had been the *ſame*, had he ſaid: If an Image be *not worſhipped* with *Divine* Worſhip, then *it is worſhipped* with *Divine* Worſhip: for the *Worſhip* due to *God*, is *Divine* Worſhip, and that which is *diſtinct* from it, is *not Divine* Worſhip. So hard a thing it is for one, who intends miſchief, to meddle with ſuch edge-tools as *School-diſtinctions* are, and not cut his own fingers. And this is not the firſt time my Adverſary hath done ſo. However he will not lay them down yet: but if it be the *former*, i. e. the *ſame* Worſhip *that*, ſaith he, *is condemned of Idolatry by Bellarmine, becauſe the Creature is equally worſhipped with God*: and if the *latter*, i.e. *diſtinct*, *this* is oppugned by *Veſquez* (*a man of great Reputation too, and of as ſearching a Wit as Bellarmine*) *as a certain kind of Superſtition or Idolatry, becauſe Man expreſſeth ſubmiſſion to an Inanimate Thing. From whence he concludes that it is in mens choice what ſort of Idolatry they will commit who worſhip Images, but in neither way can they avoid it.* And here it is he thinks he hath *pinch'd* us ſore, and yet will not give us leave to *cry out* upon himſelf and his Partizans for their *inſincere* P. 102, 103.

and

and *ſophiſtical* mixing the *Diſputes* and *Nicetties* of the *Schools* with the Doctrine of the *Church*. But how little the *Faith* and *Practiſe* of the *Church* is concerned in them, I ſhall let the Reader ſee by a Parallel example in a paſſage relating to *Civil Worſhip*. A *Gentleman* at Court paſſing through the Guard-Chamber, ſaw a *Countrey-man* there engaged in a *Diſpute* with three or four of the *Yeomen*. The Clown, it ſeems, would have gone into the *Preſence* cover'd. They pull'd him back, and told him when he went into that Room, he muſt pull off his Hat. He asked them very pertly, To whom, or to what, for he ſaw nothing but a *Chair* and a *Canopy?* They told him, It was the Kings *Chair* of State, and he muſt do it to the *Chair* out of reſpect to the *King*. The Countrey-man here (perhaps he had read Dr. *St.*'s Argument, or heard him preach it, for ſuch kind of preaching hath been the ground of that part of *Quakeriſm*) began with a ſerious countenance to demand of them, whether any Worſhip at all were due to the *Chair* or no? For his part, he was a Loyal Subject of His Majeſties, and had really a ſcruple in the caſe. For if any Worſhip were due to it, it was either the *ſame* which is given to the *King*, or *diſtinct* from it. If the *ſame*, then *proper Regal Worſhip* would be given to ſomething beſide the *King*, which were *Treaſon*

ſon to do. If *diſtinct*, then the *Chair* would be worſhipped with *Regal Honour* for it ſelf, and not *relatively*, which were for a *man* to ſubmit himſelf to a piece of *Wood*: And he had ſo much eſteem for his Manhood, that he would not debaſe it ſo far, for all their Halbards. Here the *Yeomen* of the *Guard* bid him leave his *quibbling*, and do his *duty*; which he refuſing to do, unleſs they would ſatisfie his ſcruple, they took him by the ſhoulders and thruſt him out of doors. The paſſage no doubt was *pleaſant*, but withal ſo *parallel* to the *Doctors* proceeding in this matter, that I cannot but *ſeriouſly* deſire to know of him, whether he judge it a ſufficient excuſe for the Clown not to put off his Hat, becauſe he did not, or would not underſtand what *kind* of Worſhip was due to the *Chair*. Or, (to put the example in a thing relating to the Worſhip of *God*, of which I ſhall ſpeak more in the next Chapter) whether *Moſes* and *Joſue* might have refuſed to have put off their Shoes in *reverence* to the Ground where they ſtood, till they had firſt been ſatisfied, whether it were the *ſame* Worſhip they gave to *God*, or *diſtinct* from it? That they *did lawfully teſtifie their Reverence towards the* Ground, is affirmed by himſelf, p. 105. and if they were not retarded from doing it by the Doctors *Dilemma*, no more ought *Chriſtians* from teſtifying

fying their *Reverence* to the *Images* of *Christ* and his *Saints*. Let *Plato* and *Aristotle* with their followers wrangle as much as they will about the *manner* how we come to *see*; the former contending that it *cannot* be done by the *Object's* uniting it self with the *Eye*; the latter asserting as strongly, that it *cannot* be done by the *Eye's* sending forth *Rays* to the *Object*: Must we therefore stand still with our *Eyes shut*, till it be agreed between them by which of the two ways we are to *see*? At this rate we must neither *see*, nor *hear*, nor *feel*, nor *move*, till it be accorded between *Philosophers* how these Operations are performed, which will be never. Let the *Schoolmen* then dispute as much as they please about the *manner* how *Honour* is given to an *Image*, yet honest *Nature* will teach us to do it for his sake who is represented by it, with as much security, and as little danger of erring, as any of the aforesaid Operations. What the *Councils declare* in this matter (and *to them* it is the *Doctor* himself confesses p. 209. that *we must appeal for the Churches sense*) is that we are not to give *Latria*, the Worship due onely to God, but a *honourary* Respect or Adoration to *Holy Images*, as to the Books of Holy Scriptures and other things belonging to God.

§. 4. This

§. 4. This is what the *Church* requireth of her Children to believe, and this is all that a *Catholick Controvertist* is bound to ſpeak to. Nor do the Arguments the Doctor brings in reality deſerve to be anſwered otherwiſe than *Zeno*'s Arguments againſt Motion were anſwered by *Diogenes*. For *Zeno* proves every jot as ſubtilly that a man cannot move an inch without breaking his neck, as the Doctor doth that we cannot honour the *Image* of *Chriſt* without falling into *Idolatry*. Nevertheleſs I ſhall yield ſo far to the Doctors importunity, (becauſe he pretends to be *ſerious*) as to return an Anſwer to his Captious Demand, Whether the *Worſhip given to the Image be the ſame that is given to the Prototype, or diſtinct from it?* And I am the rather induced to do it, in St. *Thomas* his way, who holds that *the ſame Reverence is given to Chriſt and to his Image*: becauſe I find my Adverſary himſelf (in caſe any Honour or Veneration be due to the Image, as the *Council* affirms there is) p. 79. very well inclin'd to allow of St. *Thomas* his Reaſon for it, becauſe, as the ſaid St. *Thomas* well obſerves (ſaith Dr. *St.*) *the motion of the Soul towards an Image, as it is an Image, is the ſame with that which is towards the thing repreſented by it.* When therefore he objects, that *if it be the ſame, then proper Divine Worſhip is given to the Image*, I deny the

the Conſequence, becauſe although it be the *ſame* as to the *ſubſtance* of the Act, yet it falls upon the *Image* after an *inferiour manner*, as a thing relating to *God*, and purely *for his ſake*. Hence it is, that St. *Thomas* his followers diſtinguiſh in the *ſame* Act of Worſhip a *double* notion; the One of *Abſolute Latria*, as it tends to *God* Himſelf; the other of *Relative Latria*, as it reflects upon the *Image* for his ſake. Now to help the Fancy in *ſo nice* a Speculation, ſome inſtances are uſed of *other Acts* which tend to different Terms or Objects relating to one another; which though not in all things *parallel*, yet ſerve to ſhow how the *ſame* indiviſible Act may include different *habitudes* or *reſpects*, the one inferiour to the other. Is it not an Act of *Chriſtian Charity* to help our Neighbours *Horſe* or his *Aſs* out of a *ditch*, and yet if we conſider the *Act* as preciſely tending to relieve the *Horſe*, it is not *Charity*, but an *inferiour* kind of love, (if we may ſo call it) or rather *compaſſion* of the Beaſt? And do not the *Saints* in Heaven *ſee God* and the *Creatures* by the ſame Act of *Beatifical Viſion*, and yet the *Act* as conſidered preciſely in order to the *Creatures*, is *not Beatifical*, but of an *inferiour* kind to it ſelf, as terminated upon the *Eſſence* of *God*? In like manner ſay theſe *Divines*, although the Act or motion of the Soul be the *ſame* to the *Prototype*

totype and the *Image*; and as terminated upon the Prototype, it be *Abſolute Latria*; yet as it falls preciſely upon the *Image*, it is not ſo, but a *Relative* or inferiour Veneration for the *Prototype's* ſake. As for what he urges out of *Bellarmin* againſt its being the *ſame* becauſe *it is*, ſaith the *Doctor*, *of the nature of Latria* (*Bellarmin* ſaith *true Latria*) *to be given for it ſelf*. It is evident *Bellarmin* takes the word *Latria* to ſignifie onely that Worſhip which is given to *Soveraign Excellency* for it ſelf; whereas Saint *Thomas* and his Followers qualifie it with the addition of *Relative*, which is of a diminiſhing nature, to ſignifie that the Worſhip is given to the Image by the ſame Act, but after an *inferiour manner* for the *Prototype's* ſake. So that the whole diſpute in effect is rather *de modo loquendi*, of the manner of ſpeaking, than of the thing it ſelf. For *Bellarmin* himſelf in the precedent Chapter maintaineth expreſly, that the *Image* may be worſhipped with the *ſame Worſhip* as the *Prototype*; For, ſaith he, *he that adoreth a Perſon, adoreth alſo all ſuch things as are united to him; as he that adoreth the King in his Garment, adoreth together with him his Garment alſo. And whereas the Image is conceived at the ſame time as united with the*

Bellarm. de Imag. li. 2. c. 24.

Cap. 23.

Proto-

Prototype which is adored, it followeth that the Image it ſelf is adored but per accidens, ſaith he, *becauſe it is neither the perſon adored, nor the reaſon of adoring, but a thing conjoyned to the Perſon who is adored.*

Thus much to the Doctors Queſtion in a Point belonging to the *Schools*, and not at all to *Faith*; for although neither St. *Thomas*, nor *Bellarmin*, nor *Vaſquez*, nor any other *Schoolman*, had ever diſputed, *Whether Worſhip be given to the Image by the ſame Act by which it is given to the Prototype, or a diſtinct one*, yet *Chriſtians* would have underſtood well enough by the *Churche's* declaration, that they are not to give the *Worſhip* due only to *God*, to an *Image*, but onely a *Honourary Reſpect or Veneration* for his ſake, as to other *Holy things*. Whether the Doctor will be ſatisfied with what I have ſaid to one ſide of his *Dilemma*, I cannot tell; but I ſhall give him occaſion in the next Chapter, if he pleaſe, to ſpeak to both; at leaſt I expect he ſhould uſe the ſame candor with me, that I have done with him, to let me know which *Side* he will take, for *one* he *muſt*.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

Of the Inſtances brought to explicate the nature of the Honour given to Images; from the like Reverence given to the Chair of State, to the Ground, to the Ark, to the Name of JESUS, *&c. The weakneſs of the Doctors Evaſions laid open, and his own Arguments return'd upon him.*

AFter I had in my Reply declar'd what kind of Honour it is which *Catholicks* give to the *Images* of *Chriſt* and his *Saints*, I added, as a farther Explication of it, that it was *much like the Honour given to the Chair of State, or the Kings Picture, or his Garment; or to come nearer to the ſubject ſuch as was given to the Ground by Moſes and Joſue's putting off their Shoes; to Gods Footſtool, by the Jews adoring or falling down before it: and by Proteſtants themſelves to the Name of* JESUS, *to the Euchariſt and the Altar.* By theſe Inſtances, he ſays, *I thought to eſcape*; what I *thought* was, that I had explicated clearly enough by them the *nature* of the *honour* we give to *Images*: but how much he finds himſelf *entangled* in them, and how ſore they *pinch* him on every ſide, whilſt

they force him to *ſay* and *unſay*; to ſhuffle, and ſhift, and make uſe of all his little Artifices, to free himſelf, but in vain, will appear from the Examination of the ſeveral *Evaſions*, rather than *Anſwers*, he gives to them.

§. 1. For the *honour given to the Chair of State*, (and we may ſuppoſe he means the ſame of the *Kings Picture* and *Garment*) he ſays, that our *diſpute is not concerning Civil Worſhip, but Divine*. And here, in the firſt place, he impoſes upon his Reader, for the Diſpute between *Catholicks* and *Proteſtants*, is not whether *Divine* Worſhip may be given to Images, for *that* they acknowledge to be due to *God alone*; but whether they may not give an *inferiour* or *honourary* reſpect and veneration to them for his ſake? This I ſaid was much like the *honour given to the Chair of State*; that is, as we honour the *Chair* for the *Kings* ſake, and yet do not give the *ſame Regal honour* to the *Chair*, as to the *King*; ſo in like manner we honour Chriſts *Picture* or *Image*, and yet give not the *ſame Divine honour* to the Image as to Himſelf, but an *inferiour* Reſpect and Reverence, as hath been above declared. The Compariſon then you ſee is onely about the *way* or *manner* of giving Honour, which may be the *ſame* to *God* and the *King*, although the Honour ſo given be very different; and therefore for the Doctor

ſtor to tell his Reader, that the inſtance was in a matter of *Civil Worſhip*, is juſt, as if when St. *Auſtin* to perſwade his friend *Honoratus* to believe the Myſteries of *Religion* without ſeeing them, *Li. de utilit. Cred.*

becauſe he did the *like* in many things in order to this preſent Life, he ſhould have anſwered him, that he miſtook the caſe, for *their diſpute was not about Humane Faith*; which is one of thoſe Anſwers the Adage terms ἀπροσδιόνυσα, nothing to the purpoſe. But though he ſay *our diſpute is not concerning Civil Worſhip*, yet 'tis obſervable, he does not tell us clearly, whether he hold it lawful to give any *ſuch Worſhip* to the *Chair* or no. If he do not, I grant he proceeds conformable to his own Principles againſt the Worſhip of Images, and ſo leave him to diſpute it with the *Guard*. If he do, the Countrey-man (of whom I ſpake in the precedent Chapter) ſets upon him with his own Argument; that *either the honour he gives to the Chair, is the ſame with that which he gives to the King, or diſtinct from it. If it be the ſame, then proper Regal Worſhip is given to the Chair. If diſtinct, then the Chair is worſhipped with Regal Worſhip for it ſelf*, &c. and it is in his choice to take which part of the *Dilemma* likes him beſt. But to preſs the Inſtance yet cloſer: If he do acknowledge

that *Civil Honour* is given to the *Chair* of State, let him give a ſufficient Reaſon, why a like *proportionable Reverence* (call it by what Name you will) may not be given to the *Image* of *Chriſt*. This will be to ſpeak to the purpoſe, but that was not his intention, and therefore he flies for refuge to a frivolous ſuppoſition, that *I would not ſay that were any honour to the King, in caſe he had abſolutely forbidden it, as we have proved*, ſaith he, *God hath done in the caſe of Images*. As for that pretty *ſelf-denying Ordinance* of a Prince's forbidding any Reverence to be given to his Picture or Chair of State, (which perhaps the Doctor thinks very fit ſhould be enacted in conformity to what God (he ſaith) hath forbidden in the ſecond Commandment) were it, I ſay, enacted, I grant as formerly that to diſobey it would be to diſhonour the King, as the diſobeying any other Law would be; but that hinders not but the Act intrinſecally and of its own nature would be an Act of *Reverence* to the King; for, *Honor*, as the Philoſopher ſaith, *eſt in honorante*, Honour reſides in the mind that gives it. And for any *Command* of *God* forbidding to *honour* the *Images* of *Chriſt* and his *Saints*, beſides that I have ſhown that Aſſertion of his and his Partizans, to be in every reſpect groundleſs, yet for the ſatisfaction of the *true Proteſtant* Reader, I ſhall adde

one

one Obſervation more upon that ſubject: and it is this, that the *Compilers* of the 39 *Articles* (in which is contained the Doctrine of the *Church* of *England*) ſufficiently inſinuate they could find no ſuch Command, when they rejected the *Adoration of Images*, not as Idolatry (as the Doctor doth) but onely as a *fond thing*, *vainly invented*; not *as repugnant to the plain words of Scripture*, (as they profeſs very roundly, though without ground, when they come to ſpeak of *Tranſubſtantiation*) but as being *rather repugnant to the Word of God*, which qualification of theirs plainly gives us to underſtand, that they had done their endeavours to find a *Command*, but could meet with none; for had they made any ſuch diſcovery either in the *Second Commandment*, or elſewhere in the *Word of God*, they would not have ſpared to tell us of it, and have cry'd it down for flat *Idolatry*, as the Doctor does. In the mean time it is pleaſant to ſee, what Veneration this Champion of the Church of *England* hath either for the *Compilers* of thoſe *Articles*, or for the *Articles* themſelves, when *what* they call onely a *fond thing*, *a vain Invention*; he condemns as *Idolatry*, moſt damnable Idolatry; and *Magiſterially* declares it to be *expreſly prohibited in the ſecond Command-*

Art. 22.

Art. 28.

ment; when they after the best enquiry they could make, pronounce onely *Problematically* that in their Judgment, they thought it to be *rather repugnant to the Word of God*, than conformable to it. So much does a *Pigmy* upon a *Giant*'s Shoulders (the modest *Emblem* of *Novel* Wits) see farther than the *Giant* himself, upon whose Neck he presumptuously sets his feet.

§. 2. The second Instance was of the *Reverence which God commanded Moses and Josue to give to the Ground whereon they stood, by putting off their shoes, because it was Holy.* After a short *descant* upon the former erroneous Ground, viz. that *he thinks there is some little difference between what God hath commanded, and what he hath forbidden*, p. 105. After this short descant, I say, and one *Note* in it above *Els*, that *there is as plain a Prohibition against giving honour to the Image of Christ, as in the case of Moses and Josue there was an express Command to do it to the Ground.* (Alas for the *Compilers* of the 39 *Articles*, that they could not see it!) At length he gives *Glory* to *God*, and tells us, that *the special presence & appearance of God doth sanctifie a place to so high a degree, that we may lawfully testifie our Reverence towards it.* Who will not here admire the force of *Truth*, which after long standing out, makes all her Adversaries *submit* to her power? What could

the

the Doctor have said so much to the *ruine* of his own Cause, and the *establishing* of ours, as to confess that *Moses and Josue might and did lawfully testifie their Reverence towards the Ground?* I can easily believe his *Passion* blinded him so far, that he did not foresee the *Darts* he threw so spitefully against the *Images* of *Christ*, would recoil (as they do) with double force upon his own head. For a subtil *Logician* like himself, would ask him here, whether *this Reverence* he speaks of, were *Absolute* or *Relative*, that is, were testified to the *Ground* for *it self*, or meerly for *God's sake* who appeared there present? His Answer, I doubt not, would be, that it was not to the Ground for *it self*, but meerly out of *respect* to *God*. And what would his *Opposer* do here, but first turn his *own Comparison* upon him, p. 100. that this was *just as if an unchaste Wife should plead in her excuse to her Husband, that the Person she was too kind with, was a near Friend of his, and that it was out of respect to him, she gave him the honour of his Bed?* And then make a grave application upon it, as the Doctor does, *That if such an excuse will not be taken by a Jealous Husband, how much less will such like pretences avail with that God who hath declared himself particularly jealous of his honour, and that he will not give his Glory to another, but hath reserved all Divine Worship*

as proper to himself, and no such fond excuses of relative and inferiour Worship will serve, when they encroach upon his Pregrogative? Neither would this subtil *Disputant* be content to stop here, but would farther adde, that *for his part he could see no reason,* why had he been in *Moses* and *Josue's* place, but *he might with as little scruple have offered sacrifice to the Ground, as put off his shoes to it. And he should think himself hardly dealt with, if he did not come off with the same distinction. For if he did it to God absolutely, and for himself, and to the Ground onely improperly and relatively, wherein were he to blame,* in the Doctors Principles? Let him deal as he pleases with this Personated *Sosia.*

For my own part, (to pursue his Method of arguing a little farther, that the Reader may see whether it leads) *I desire seriously to know of him whether any Reverence*
P. 102. *was due to the Ground or no? If none at all, to what end did they put off their shoes, which if the Ground* (as he saith of *Images*) *had any sense in it, would think was done to it?* Why was there an expres Command to require it? *And why doth the Doctor himself determine that they might lawfully testifie their Reverence towards the Ground because it was sanctified or Holy, if none were due? If there were any due, whether it were the same which was given to God, or distinct from it?*

it? If it were the ſame, then proper Divine Worſhip was given to the Ground; if diſtinct, then the Ground was worſhipped with Divine Worſhip for it ſelf, and not relatively. Again, either it was *Divine* Worſhip, or an *Inferiour* Worſhip *diſtinct* from it. If it were *Divine* Worſhip, then the Argument he urges out of *Bellarmin*, (p.103.) returns upon him, that *it is the nature of Divine Worſhip to be given for it ſelf; and therefore if it were given to the Ground, the Creature was equally worſhipped with God, which certainly was Idolatry.* If it were *not Divine*, but an *Inferiour* Worſhip, *diſtinct* from that which is given to God, then *Vaſquez*, (*a man of great Reputation too, and of as ſearching a Wit as Bellarmin*) comes upon him, that *he that ſo gives it, incurs the crime of Idolatry, becauſe he expreſſeth his ſubmiſſion to a meer inaninate thing, that hath no kind of excellency to deſerve it from him.* So that upon the whole, what follows in Doctor *St.*'s *Logick* is, that *it was in Moſes and Joſue's choice what ſort of Idolatry they would commit, when they teſtified their Reverence to the Ground, but in neither way could they avoid it.* I cannot expect he will ſet much by the *Authority* of *Bellarmin* and *Vaſquez*; but what I expect and in juſtice may exact from him, is, that he will anſwer their Reaſons, at leaſt one of them, if he embrace the other; or elſe give a ſufficient

cient reaſon himſelf why this *manner* of arguing is *abſurd* againſt the *Reverence* he confeſſes due to the *Ground*, and not againſt the *Reverence* we aſſert to be due to *Holy Images*. If he fly to the *old ſhift*, of an expreſs *Command* for the one, and a pretended *Prohibition* for the other, no relief is to be had from thence; for beſides his giving *Gods ſpecial preſence* here as a *ſecond* and diſtinct reaſon why *they might lawfully teſtifie their Reverence towards the Ground*, whether there were any Command or no; yet taking in the Command, the Argument hath ſtill the ſame force as before. For either *the Reverence they were commanded to teſtifie towards the Ground, becauſe it was Holy, was the ſame which they gave to God, or diſtinct from it. If the ſame, then proper Divine Worſhip was given to the Ground by Gods Command; If diſtinct, then the Ground was worſhipped with Divine Worſhip for it ſelf.* Both *Idolatry* in their own *nature* according to *his Principles:* And conſequently it is now *in his choice*, whether he will blame *Moſes* and *Joſue* for committing, or *God* for commanding them to commit *Idolatry*. If it were *Idolatry* in the nature of the thing to *put off their ſhoes in reverence to the Ground*, *God's Command* could not make it to be otherwiſe. And if it were *not Idolatry* in it ſelf, neither is it to give a *like honour* to the *Image of Chriſt*. From whence

whence it follows to the utter ruine of all he hath argued from his *pretended Prohibition*, that as no *Command* of *God* can make that to be *not Idolatry*, which is ſo in the nature of the thing: ſo no *Prohibition* (if there were any) could make that to be *Idolatry*, which hath not in it the true and real nature of *Idolatry*. Here the *Ax* is laid to the *Root*, and if ever the Doctor will ſpeak home to the purpoſe, it muſt be upon this point. He muſt ſpeak to the nature of the thing, and not ſtand pointing at the Sky, as *Polus* did, to perſwade the World he ſees a *fiery Dragon*, and that all are blind who ſee it not, when there is nothing but *pure Air*. What he faintly ſuggeſts at preſent, as ſome little difference between the caſe of giving *reverence* to the *Ground*, and that of giving the like to *Images*, viz. that *God was preſent in the place by a ſpecial appearance, but is not ſo in Images*, is (to uſe his own Compariſon, that he may ſee how fit it was to the matter he applied it) *juſt as if an unchaſte Wife ſhould plead in her excuſe to her Husband for giving a Friend of his the honour of his Bed, that ſhe did it not when he was abſent, but to teſtifie her greater reſpect to him, at a time when he was particularly preſent: and can any one think* but *that ſuch an excuſe as this would be taken by a Jealous Husband?* He adds for a farther difference, that *the Reverence then requir'd,*

was

was not kiſſing the Ground, or bowing to it, much leſs praying to it, but onely putting off their ſhoes. And I wonder what Edition of the *Council* of *Trent* he makes uſe of, to ground this *calumny of praying to Images*, ſo often repeated by him: for in all thoſe printed in *Catholick Countries*, we are told we are not *to ask any thing of them:* and I wonder no leſs by what *Rule* he makes *putting off the ſhoes* to be a ſign of *leſs reverence*, than *kiſſing* the *Ground*, or *bowing to it*. The *Rubrick* of the *Miſſal* preſcribes it to be done but once a year by the *Prieſt* upon *Good Friday* to teſtifie a *greater Reverence* to the *Image* of our *Crucified Lord*. But I ſhall not diſpute it with him, onely I perſwade my ſelf, that if the *Common-Prayer-Book* ſhould ordain the *Miniſter* when he goes up to the *Communion-Table* either to *put off his ſhoes*, or to *bow to it*, he would ſcruple much more to go *barefoot*, than to *nod* to it with his Shoes on.

Two other pretences of difference he brings not unlike the former: The firſt, that in *kiſſing* the *Ground*, or *bowing to it*, *if theſe things had been done to the Ground, the danger had not been ſo great as to Images.* The other, that *the Reverence of Holy Places and Things, is of a quite different nature from the Worſhip of Images.* For the firſt of *danger*, he may leave that (as Mr. *Thorndike* hath told him) *to the Judgment of the Church.* And for the ſecond,

ſecond, *Holy Places* and *Things* may have ſeveral Relations to God, according to the different uſes for which they ſerve in order to his Worſhip; and yet the *Reverence* given them may be *proportionably alike*, that is, an *inferiour Reſpect* and Veneration, and *not Latria*, which is due to God alone. But how different ſoever he would make it from that of *Images*, he muſt *not think to eſcape*; For if any be due at all to *Holy Places* and *Things*, I ſuppoſe it is given them for *God's ſake*, and then all his own Arguments return upon him afreſh; for *either it is the ſame which is given to God, or diſtinct from it*; and which way ſoever he take, *Bellarmin* or *Vaſquez* will be upon him. Or *none* at all is due to them, and then he mocks his Reader, when he tells him, that *the Reverence of Holy Places and Things, is of a quite different nature from the Worſhip of Images*. And this is indeed what lies at the bottom, how ſpeciouſly ſoever he pretend the contrary here in words, as will manifeſtly appear from his Anſwers to the following *Inſtances*. For firſt,

§. 3. To that *of the Reverence given by the Jews to the Ark and the Holy of Holies, where the Cherubins and Propitiatory were*, he plainly enough denies that any was given them. To prove there was, I produced firſt that Text of the *Pſalm*, *Adore ye the foot-ſtool of God*,

God, for it it is holy, Pſal.xcviii.5. (as all the Ancient *Fathers* read it without ſcruple) or as their own Tranſlation hath it, *Fall down before his Foot-ſtool, for He* (the Margin hath it *It*) *is holy*. And ſecondly, the Teſtimony of St. *Hierom*, who ſaith expreſly (*Ep.17. ad Marcel.*) *Venerabantur olim, that the Jews in times paſt did worſhip or reverence the Holy of Holies, becauſe there were the Cherubins, the Propitiatory, the Ark*, &c. To neither of theſe doth he vouchſafe any Anſwer at all, but with an *Ipſe dixit*, tells us, p. 106. that *the Jews onely directed their Worſhip towards that place where* God *had promiſed to be ſignally preſent among them; and ſignifies no more to the Worſhip of Images, than our lifting up our Eyes to Heaven doth, when we pray.* Thus He, Oracularly, without either *Scripture*, or *Father*, or *Reaſon* to abet him. But if *Moſes* and *Joſue* might lawfully teſtifie their *Reverence* to the Ground, becauſe *it* was *holy*, why might not the *Jews* do as much to the *Foot-ſtool* of God, becauſe *that* alſo was *holy?* Why was it placed in the *Holy of Holies*, and why were the People commanded to *adore*, or *bow down before it*, but to *teſtifie* their *Reverence* to it, and that a *much greater*, in the Doctors opinion, than *putting off their ſhoes*, for they were to *adore it*, or *fall down before it:* and all this, I hope, *ſignifies* ſomething *more* to the *Worſhip* of

Images

Images than the lifting up our Eyes to Heaven doth, when we pray; which might have been as well, if not better, without all this Ceremony, in an open field.

For the *Cherubins*, he tells, That *they were always hid from the ſight of the People*; as if nothing could have *Reverence* given it, but what is ſeen: It may reaſonably be preſumed, that himſelf will charge us with *Idolatry* for adoring the *Hoſt*, not onely when we *ſee* it upon the Altar, but when it is *recluded* in a Tabernacle, or *covered* with a Veil. Nor doth he mend the matter when he ſays, That *the High Prieſt himſelf went into the Holy of Holies but once a year*; for if at that time it were *lawful* for him to teſtifie *Reverence* to the Throne of God there placed, it is as much as we deſire; and if *unlawful*, it was more than he ought to have done, though but once a year; for as St. *Hierom* ſaith, *Quod ſemel feciſſe bonum eſt, non poteſt malum eſſe, ſi frequenter fiat; aut ſi aliqua culpa vitanda eſt, non ex eo quod ſæpe, ſed ex eo quod ſit aliquando, culpabile eſt.* *Li. adverſ. Vigilant.*

What he adds of the *Cherubins* being placed meerly *as Appendices to the Throne of God*, was a means rather to *increaſe* than *diminiſh* the people's *reverence* to them; and for their *form*, there needed no more be known than what *Calvin* (*in Exod.* xxv. 18.) affirmeth

eth of them, That *they represented Angels.*

§. 4. *To bowing at the Name of* JESUS. This Ceremony was appointed and allowed by the *Injunctions* made in the time of *Queen Elizabeth*, Art. 52. and was defended by Dr. *Whitgift* in his Defence against *Cartright*, by Dr. *Fulk*, Dr. *Andrews*, (whose words are cited below) and others; and is at this day *publickly* practised in the *Church* of *England*, and that in Dr. *St.*'s own sight, by such as esteem themselves the onely *true* and *genuine* Sons of *that Church*. This Instance I thought to be very pertinent, because first it is allowed by *Protestants*, and so more easily understood; and secondly because of the *Analogy* there is between *Words* and *Pictures*, a *Picture* being a *Word* to the *Eye*, and a *Word* (as *Aristotle* calls it) a *Picture* to the *Ear*. Another reason I had also, because the Doctor being inoculated into the Church of *England*, or, (to speak his Dialect) *a Revolted Presbyterian*, I thought he would not dare to disavow all *reverence* to the Sacred Name of JESUS. But I find I was deceived; for he tells me plainly, *I might as well have instanced in going to Church at the Toll of a Bell, as in bowing at the Name of Jesus; for as the one onely*

Tr. 21. ch. 7.

Ag. Rhem. Test. Phil. ii. 10.

Peri Herm. c. 1.

only tells us the time when, so the other only puts us in mind of the Person whom we are to worship. This is plain enough, I confess (if it be as mannerly) to tell us that no more *Reverence* is due to the most H. *Name* of JESUS, when we hear it spoken, than to a *Bell* when we hear it *toll.* And the Comparison is somewhat more elevated, than if he had made it with *Whittington's* fancying the *Bells* to call him back to be *Lord Maior* of *London.* But was this all that St. *Paul* meant, when he told us, That *at the Name of Jesus* (or as Dr. *St.* himself reads it, p. 111. *To the Name of Jesus*) *every knee shall bow?* Phil. ii. 10. Was it for this that *God* so highly *exalted* Him, that *He gave Him a Name which is above every Name,* that it might have as much *Reverence* given *It,* as we give to great *Meg* of *Westminster?* What would Bishop *Andrews* have said, had he lived to hear this? 'Verily (saith He in his Sermon up-'on the foregoing words of St. *Paul*) God 'will not have us worship him like *Ele-'phants,* as if we had no Joynts in our 'Knees. He will have more honour of men, 'than of the *Pillars* of the Church. He will 'have us to *bow* our Knees, and let us *bow* 'them in God's Name, and *To* his Name. 'For this is another Prerogative. He is ex-'alted to whose *Person* Knees do bow; but 'He to whose *Name* onely much more. But

'the cauſe is here otherwiſe. For his *Perſon* 'is taken up out of our ſight; all we can 'do, will not reach unto it. But his Name 'he hath left behind to us, that we may 'ſhew by our *Reverence* and *Reſpect to it*, 'how much we eſteem him; How true the 'Pſalm ſhall be, *Holy and Reverend is his* 'Name. But if we have much ado to get it 'how at all; much more ſhall we have to 'get it done to his *Name*. There be that do 'it not; what ſpeak I of not doing it? There 'be that not onely forbear to do it them-'ſelves, but put themſelves to an *evil Occu-'pation*, to find faults where none is, and 'caſt ſcruples into mens minds, by no means 'to do it——And again a little after. 'But 'to keep us to the Name. This is ſure; the 'words themſelves (of St. *Paul*) are ſo *plain*, 'as they are able to *convince* any mans Con-'ſcience. And there is no Writer (not of 'the *Ancient*) on this place that I can find, '(ſave he that turned all into *Allegories*) but 'literally underſtands it, and likes well 'enough we ſhould actually perform it. Thus Dr. *Andrews*, (*a very Learned Biſhop of his Church*, as Dr. *St.* himſelf calls him, p. 101.) And can any legitimate *Son* of *that Church* hear him preach, that *no* more *Reverence* is due to the Name of JESUS, than to the *tol-ling* of a *Bell*, and yet cry him up hereafter for a *Pillar* of *that Church* (unleſs it be in the

Biſhop's ſenſe above-mentioned) whoſe *practiſe* he expoſes as *ridiculous*, by ſo unhandſome a Compariſon? I remember at the beginning of the Long Parliament one of the firſt Wounds given to the *Church* of *England* was from a Book whoſe *Title* (as I read it poſted up in *Weſtminſter-Hall*) was *Jeſu-Worſhip Confuted*; and whether the ſame might not have been put for a *Marginal Note* to this Anſwer of the Doctors, I leave to Judgment of the Reader. Give me leave to ſpeak a Word to you, Sons of the Church of *England*; what if the Doctor ſhould come upon you for *reverencing* the Name of JESUS with your *Hat* or *Knee*, as he doth upon us for honouring in like manner his *Image*, viz. p. 102. that the *Reverence you give to that Holy Name, is either the ſame you give to God or diſtinct from it. If it be the ſame, then you give proper divine worſhip to the Name; and if it be diſtinct, then the Name is worſhipped with divine worſhip for it ſelf; and it is in your choice what ſort of Idolatry you will commit who worſhip the Name of* JESUS, *but neither way can you avoid it?* If you tell him that the *Reverence* you give that *H. Name* is *not* the *worſhip* due to *God*, but a *Relative* and *inferiour reſpect* for his ſake; he will tell you again, as he did me in the caſe of *Images*, p. 100. that *this is juſt as if an unchaſt Wife ſhould plead in her ex-*

cuſe to her Husband, that the Perſon ſhe was too kind with, was extreamly like him, and a dear friend of his, nay had his very name, and that it was out of reſpect to him, that ſhe gave him the honour of his Bed. I do not hear that he hath preſs'd this argument upon you; and if he do not, I cannot but wonder, his zeal for God's honour ſuffers you ſo long to go on in your *Idolatrous* practiſe; and much more, if he comply with you himſelf in ſhewing any *reverence* to that *Name*, for though like *a wiſer Chriſtian* (there being degrees among *Chriſtians*, as well as *Heathens*,) *he differ extreamly from the Vulgar in his Opinion of Religion, yet this is to concur with them in the external practiſe of their Idolatry* and ſo he falls under the ſame cenſure with his *wiſer Heathens*, p. 73.

Serm. 9th. of the Reſurrect. On the other ſide if he do it not, Biſhop *Andrews* hath told him he hath juſt reaſon *to fear, leaſt the Knee that will not bow, be ſtrucken with ſomething, which ſhall make it not able to bow; and for the Name, that they that will do no honour to it, when time of need comes ſhall receive no honour by it.* But to conclude this Point. If it be the ſenſe of the Sons of the *Church* of *England*, that they intend to give *no* more *reverence* to the moſt *Holy Name of Jeſus*, when they hear it *read*, than to a *Bell*, when they hear it *toll*,

tell, I confeſs I was miſtaken in alledging *this Practiſe* of theirs for an *Inſtance*. But if they acknowledge *more* is due to that ſacred *Name*, than to a *Bell*, and yet not ſo much as is due to *God* himſelf, I have the end for which I brought it, which was to let them ſee what kind of *worſhip* it is we give to the *Images* of *Chriſt*, ſuch as is given by themſelves to the *Name* of *Jeſus*. For *we* make *Images* no more the *Objects* of our *worſhip*, when we *kneel* before them, than *they* do that *Holy Name*, when they *bow* at it.

§ 5. The *Fift* Inſtance was of the *Reverence given to the Sacramental ſigns in the Supper by kneeling before them*; which if the *Bread* and *Wine* had *any ſenſe in them* (as he ſaith *of Images*, p. 102.) *would think were done to them*. And what ſaith my Adverſary to this, Marry, that *this of all things ſhould not be objected to them*. If you ask him why? He tells you, becauſe *they have declared in their Rubrick after the Communion, that thereby no adoration is intended or ought to be done either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine, there bodily received; or any corporal preſence of Chriſt's Natural Fleſh and Blood; for the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain ſtill in their very natural ſubſtances, and therefore may not be adored. For that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Chriſtians*. I confeſs I reflected upon this

Rubrick, when I put down *Kneeling at the Eucharist* for an Instance; but I could not imagin the Doctor would make it a matter of *Triumph* over the *Church* of *England*. It is not yet more than a dozen years, since this *Rubrick* was inserted into the *Communion Book*, and the occasion is well known to have been a design to gain scrupulous and dissenting Parties to a conformity in so innocent a *Ceremony*. And because the *Church* of *England* hath been so *kind* to those who dissented from her, as to declare *no adoration is intended by it to the Bread and Wine, or any corporal presence of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood*; Will the *Doctor* be so *unkind*, as to make her say, that *no Reverence* at all is *due* to that *Holy Sacrament?* that *this of all things* in the World *ought not to have been objected against them?* What! will he make them fall below *Calvin* in their respect to that *Sacrament*, who saith, *it is to be received with reverence, as the Pledge of our Holy Union with Christ?* Is it not time now to remind him, as I promised above, *p.* 138. how his Beloved *Constantinopolitan Fathers* call it *an Honourable Image of Christ's quickning Body?* And thereupon invite *all those* (and among them the Doctor, unless he will leave himself out, as he did these words) *all those* I say *to rejoyce*

Just. lib. 4. c. 17.

and

and exult with confidence, who deſire, worſhip, and offer it for the Salvation both of Soul and Body? Though He ſtile me very ineptly a *Revolted Proteſtant*, yet I have ſo much reſpect for thoſe learned Perſons who made that *Rubrick*, as to think they meant by *Adoration*, what the word now ſignifieth by uſe in *Engliſh*, that is, *Divine Worſhip* proper to *God* alone: and not, that no more Reverence ſhould be uſed towards the Bread and Wine in the *Church*, than there is to the Remainder of it at home, by ſome ſeemingly-*Revolted Presbyterians* (I cannot believe them to be truly Sons of the *Church of England.*) Now what the *ſenſe* of that *Church* was, and ſtill is, unleſs the Doctor will have us ſuppoſe theſe *Modern Divines* to have prevaricated from their *Fathers*, Biſhop *Jewel* tells us in theſe words. *We only adore Chriſt* ſaith he, *as very God, but we Worſhip alſo, and Reverence the Sacrament, we Worſhip the Word of God, we worſhip all other like things in ſuch Religious wiſe to Chriſt belonging.* Reply againſt *Hard.* p. 379.

The ſame is witneſſed by Biſhop *Morton, Under the degree of Divine Worſhip, we our ſelves yield as much to the Euchariſt*, as *St.* Auſtin *did to Baptiſme, where he ſaid* (Epiſt. 164.) *We reverence Baptiſme whereſoever it is.* Nor Of the Maſs. l. 7. c. 2. S. 3.

is

is this delivered by them as their *private opinion*, but as the *ſenſe* of the *Church* of *England*, as appears by their words. And if you ask, how they can excuſe themſelves from *Idolatry*, you have the Anſwer of Biſhop *Jewel*; that *the Sacraments be adored, but the whole honour reſteth not in them, but is paſſed over from them to the things ſignified.* So that it ſeems I was not much mi-

Reply. p. 409.

ſtaken, when, to paralel the *Reverence* given by *Catholicks* to *Images*, I inſtanced in that which is given by *Proteſtants* to the Sacramental ſigns by *kneeling at the Euchariſt*; for they do not only allow *a like Reverence*, but maintain it alſo with the ſame *diſtinction*: Nor will the Doctor ever be able to perſwade his *Pariſhioners* out of it, till he can make them leave their uſual Expreſſion, when they ſpeak of this *Sacrament* that they do not receive it *as Bread*, but *as the Body of Chriſt*.

§. 6. The *6th.* and laſt Inſtance was of *Reverence given to the Altar by bowing to it*; a practiſe of great *Antiquity*, as Dr. *Heylin* ſhows in his defence of the *Modern* Practiſe of it in the *Church* of *England* againſt *Burton*, p. 25. This Dr. *Still.* ſaith, *it of the ſame nature with the putting off our Hats, while we are in the Church*; And what is this to ſay? Himſelf admits a *Reverence to Holy Places*;

Places, (p. 105.) and ſurely the *Church*, the *Houſe of God* is one of them. Here then we find him incline to admit a *Reverence* due to the Altar; and *if it be of the ſame nature with putting off our Hats while we are in the Church*, as he doth the *one*, ſo he may lawfully do the *other*. But then, as if he had granted too much, he preſently draws back, and tells us, *This is only determining a natural act of Reverence, that way which the ancient Chriſtians did uſe to direct their Worſhip*: (which as far as I can underſtand the words) is not of the ſame nature with *putting off our Hats when we are in the Church*, but with *going to Church* when the *Bell tolls*, which is to give no more Reverence to the *Altar*, than to the *Bell*. But who can unfold the Riddle, and tell me what he means by *a natural Act of Reverence that way which the ancient Chriſtians did uſe to direct their Worſhip?* If he mean by *that way* the *local ſituation* of the *Altar* in the *Eaſt*, which was *the way the ancient Chriſtians uſed to direct their Worſhip*, and that *Nature* teacheth us to direct our Worſhip *that way*; although the *Altar* (for example) in St. *Andrew's*, may ſerve for ſuch a determination, becauſe it is placed in the *Eaſt*: yet he muſt give another reaſon why thoſe in the *Savoy* bow towards the *Altar*, where it is ſeated in the *North*, becauſe it doth not *there* determin a

Natural

Natural Act of Reverence that way, which the ancient Christians used to direct their Worship, which was towards the *East*. But if he mean by *that way*, a *like manner of Reverence* to the *Altar*, as was used to be given by the *Ancient Christians*, he will find in the aforecited place out of Dr. *Heylin*, that they acknowledged an *honour* and *veneration* due to the *Holy Altar*, and testified that honour by *bowing* and *kneeling* to it. In fine, whatever the meaning of the words be, to speak to the practise it self, either he condemns those of the *Church* of *England* who profess and testify their reverence to the *Altar* by *bowing* to it for *Idolatry*, or no. If he do, they are at age to answer for themselves. If he do not, an *Inferiour* or *Relative* honour may be given to it for his sake whose *Throne* it is, under the degree of Divine Worship due to God alone; and as the allowing *this* will render him a *true Son* of the *Church* of *England*; so the allowing *the like* to the sacred *Images* of *Christ* will make him in this point a perfect *Proselyte* of the *Church* of *Rome*, whose *Councils* have decreed that we are not to give to the *Images* of *Christ* and his *Saints Latria*, or the worship due to *God*, but a *honourary respect and veneration*, as to the Books of H. Scripture, and other Holy things. But what himself may justly fear, should success

crown

crown his endeavours in putting ſcruples into poor ſimple Mens minds to with draw them from the *Reverence* they owe to the *Sacraments* of *Chriſt*, his *Saints*, his *Name*, his *Image*, his *Altars*, and ſuch like Holy things relating to his Worſhip, is, that the *Event* (whatever the *deſign* be) of his labours will be no other (as thoſe Pious and Learned *Doctors* of *Rhemes* long ſince obſerved, and we ſee at this Day in a great meaſure fulfilled) than to inure Men by degrees to loſe *all honour* and *reſpect* to *Chriſt* himſelf, to aboliſh all true Religion out of the World, and to make them plain *Atheiſts*. The *Chair* of *State* is not more an *Ornament* to the *King*'s *Palace*, than the *Reſpect* given to it is a *Fence* againſt the Contempt of his *Perſon*. He that paſſes by *that* with his *Hat* on, thinks himſelf excus'd upon the ſame account from putting it off to the King himſelf.

The End of the Firſt Part.

THE

THE SECOND PART OF THE ADORATION OF THE Most Bleſſed Sacrament.

CHAP. I.

The Practiſe of the Primitive Church in this Point; The Doctor's Argument to prove it to be Idolatry, built upon an Injurious Calumny, that Catholicks believe the Bread to be God. *The ſenſe of his firſt Propoſition cleared, and the Proofs he brings for it, refuted.*

§. 1. HAving cleared the *Doctrin* and *Practiſe* of the *Catholick Church* from my Adverſaries Unjuſt Charge of *Idolatry* in the *Worſhip* or *Veneration* ſhe gives to the Images of *Chriſt*, I come

come now to ſhow the *Injuſtice* of a like accuſation he brings in upon account of the Adoration ſhe gives to *Chriſt* himſelf in the *moſt H. Sacrament* of the *Altar:* A thing ſo univerſally practiced and recommended by the *Fathers* of the *Primitive Church*, both *Greek* and *Latin*, that who ſo will condemn the *practiſe* of it at this day in the *Church* of *Rome*, muſt have the confidence to involve the *Church* of that time in the ſame Condemnation with it. Among other *Apoſtolical Traditions*, which were delivered to the *Church* without Writing, St. *Baſil* reckons *the words of Invocation, when the Euchariſtical Bread and Cup of Bleſſing were ſhewed.* And *Theodoret* affirms expreſly, that *The Myſtical Symbols are underſtood to be what they are made, and are believed and adored, as being the things they are believed.* S. *Gregory Nazianzen* reporteth of his Siſter *Gorgonia* as a great teſtimony of her devotion, that in a certain ſickneſs ſhe had, *ſhe went with Faith to the Altar, and with a lowd voice beſought him, who is worſhipped upon it, for remedy, giving him all his Titles* or Attributes, *and remembring him of all the miraculous things which he had done.* And the ſame no doubt was done by St. *Monica*

Li. de Spir. S. c. 27.

Dialog. 2.

In Epitaph. Gorgoniæ.

the

the Mother of St. *Austin*, in her daily devotions at *the Altar, at which she used to assist without pretermission of any one day; and from whence she knew*, saith he, *that Holy Victime to be dispensed, by which the Hand writing was blotted out, which carried our condemnation in it. To this Sacrament of our Redemption she had tied her Soul fast by the Bond of Faith.* And in this she did no more, than what her Son teacheth upon the 98*th*. *Psalm*, where expounding those words of the Psalmist, *Adore ye his Foot-stool*, to be meant of the *Earth*, and by the *Earth*, to be understood the *Flesh of Christ*, he addeth, that *whereas Christ walked here in the Flesh, and gave us that very flesh to be eaten for our Salvation, and no man eateth that Flesh, unless he have first adored, we find*, saith he, *how such a Foot-stool of our Lord may be adored; and that we do not only not sin in adoring, but we sin in not adoring.* Viz. *that Foot-stool* of our *Lord*, by which he said before was meant his most *Holy Flesh*. And from whom did he learn this Doctrin, but from the same *Master*, from whom he learn't *Christianity*. St. *Ambrose*, who treating of the same place of the *Psalmist*, saith, *By the Foot-stool is under-*

Confess. li. 9. c. 13.

S. Aug. in Ps. 98.

Li. 3. de Sp. Sto. c. 12.

stood

ſtood the Earth, and by the Earth the Fleſh of Chriſt, which we adore alſo at this day in the Myſteries, and which the Apoſtles adored in our Lord Jeſus. Upon this Account it is, that St. *Chryſoſtome* exhorts *Chriſtians* to this duty by the Example of the *Wiſe-men: Theſe Men,* ſaith he, *though Barbarians, after a long Journey adored this Body* (of our Lord) *in the Manger, with great fear and trembling; Let us imitate what they did. Thou ſeeſt Him not in the Manger, but on the Altar.* And then again by the Example of the *Angels, who,* ſaith he, *aſſiſt the Prieſt at the time of offring the Holy Sacrifice; and the whole order of Heavenly Powers liſt up their Voices; and the place round about the Altar is filled with the Quires of Angels, in honour of Him who lyeth upon it.* And therefore it is called by St. *Optatus, the Seat* or Throne *of the Body of our Lord.* Thus theſe Holy Men, not as *private Doctors* delivering their own *Opinions,* but as *Fathers,* teſtifying and tranſmitting to Poſterity the *Doctrin* and *Practiſe* of the *Church* of their time, which was ſo notorious in this point of the *Adoration* of the *Euchariſt,* that the *Heathens* becauſe they knew *Chriſtians* made uſe of Bread and Wine in the *Myſteries,* objected

Hom. 24. in 1. ad Cor.

Li. 6. de Sacerd.

S. *Opt. li. 6. f. 61.*

objected to them, (as St. *Austin* reports,) *that they worshipped Ceres and Bacchus.* And hereupon Mr. *Thorndike* (Epil. 3. p. pag. 351.) ingenuously saith, *I do believe that it was so practised and done in the ancient Church, which I maintain from the beginning to have been the true Church of Christ*— *For I do acknowledge the testimonies that are produced out of St.* Ambrose, *St.* Austin, *St.* Chrysostome, *St.* Gregory Nazianzen: with the rest, and more than I have produced. And now it is in the Reader's choice, whether he will condemn so *great* and *Holy Men*, and with them the *Church* of that time, of *Idolatry* for adoring *our Lord Christ* in the *Sacrament* of the *Altar*, or will absolve *Us* for doing what *they* did. It is with them we must stand or fall. And the *Doctor's* argument will make *neither* or *both* Idolaters. But before I speak to that, and that the Reader may see what force it is like to have, behold how he usheres it in.

S. *Aug.* lib. 20. *contr. Faust.* c. 13.

§. 2. *I proceeded*, saith he, *to the Adoration of the Host, and here the argument I proposed, was to take off the common answer*, viz. (of Catholicks) *that it cannot be Idolatry, because they believe the Bread to be God.* This is what the Doctor exposes in the *front* of his *Rejoynder* to publick view. And if the

Reader meet with such *sophisticate* Ware in the *Mouth of* the *Sack*, What may he expect when he comes neerer to the *bottom? The argument I proposed*, saith he, *was to take off the Common Answer*, (viz. of *Catholicks*) *that it cannot be Idolatry, because they believe the Bread to be God:* And that too, *just as the Worshippers of the Sun believed the Sun to be God; For upon the same ground* he saith, it is that *they who believe the Sun to be God, and worship him on that account, would be excused from Idolatry too.* The *unhandsomness* of this Proceeding I fairly hinted to him in my Reply, whereas I might justly have called it a *most injurious calumny*; and it became an Ingenuous Writer, either to have justified his charge; or (if he could not do that, nor yet had humility enough to retract it,) to have wav'd at least the repeating it in his Answer. But this he is so far from doing, that without any proof at all, what he did but insinuate before in the Body of his Argument, he lays down now expressly in his Rejoinder, as the *Ground* of his charge of *Idolatry* in this matter. Wherefore I must now challenge him to prove it, *viz.* that *it is the Common Answer of Catholicks that their Adoration of the Eucharist cannot be Idolatry, because they believe the Bread to be God*; or if that be too much, to produce at least any one *Catholick* Author, who ever excused

cuſed himſelf from *Idolatry* upon that account. Nothing is more notorious than that Catholicks believe the whole ſubſtance of *Bread* to be converted into the *Body* of *Chriſt*, and conſequently *Bread* not to be there. Wherefore to do both himſelf and us right, he ſhould have ſaid, the *Common Anſwer of Catholicks*, when they are charged with Idolatry in the *Adoration* of the *Hoſt*, is not, *that it cannot be Idolatry, becauſe they believe the bread to be God*; but becauſe *they believe no bread at all to be there*, but *the Body of Chriſt true God*, into which it is changed. This had been to ſpeak *Truth*; but withall it had been to *ſtifle* his argument in its birth, by choaking his *Parallel* between *Catholicks* and *thoſe* who worſhipped the *Sun*, ſuppoſing it to remain ſtill the *Sun*. And why ſhould he ſcruple more to preſerve his *own Child*, than the *Ægyptian Midwives* did to ſave thoſe of *other* People?

The Argument, as it is *artificially* propoſed by himſelf, runs thus, that *Upon the ſame Ground that Catholicks would excuſe themſelves from Idolatry, becauſe they believe the bread to be God: they who believe the Sun to be God, and worſhip him on that account would be excuſed from Idolatry too*; which who ſo reads would think it intended directly to excuſe the *worſhippers* of the *Sun* from *Idolatry*. But becauſe his p. 109.

Intention is to make it fall with a revers'd blow upon *Catholicks*, and *conclude* them guilty of *Idolatry*, that the Reader may ſee the force of the Argument, I ſhall reduce it to form, as it may ſerve to infer that **Concluſion.** And this it is. *If the Worſhip of the Sun by thoſe who believe the Sun to be God, and Worſhip him on that account, be Idolatry; then the Worſhip of the bread in the Euchariſt, by thoſe who believe it to be God, and worſhip it on that account, is Idolatry.* But *it is the Common Anſwer of Papiſts*, (ſaith Dr. *St.*) *that they believe the bread to be God.* Therefore *they are Idolaters.* This is the ſumme of this mighty Argument; and there needs no more to overthrow it, but to deny as moſt notoriouſly *falſe*, the ſecond Propoſition, that *Catholicks believe the Bread to be God, as the Worſhippers of the Sun believed the Sun to be God.* Others may judge of it, as they pleaſe, but for my part I ſhould wonder extreamly, how the Doctor could have the confidence to advance ſo palpable a *calumny* the ſecond time, but that I ſee, what *art* and *courage* are neceſſary to uphold ſo *unjuſt* a charge. Perhaps he will reply, his meaning was, that *Catholicks believe that to be God, which he and his Partizans believe to be meer bread.* But then what a rare conſequence is it to ſay, the *worſhippers* of the *Sun* were *Idolaters*, becauſe they worſhipped

ſhipped for God what *themſelves* believed to be the *Sun:* Therefore *Catholicks* are *Idolaters*, becauſe they *worſhip* that for *God*, which Dr. *St.* and his Partizans believe to be but *bread?* Which is juſt, as if an *Arrian* ſhould conclude both *Catholicks* and *Proteſtants* to be Idolaters, for worſhipping *Chriſt*, becauſe they worſhip *him* for *God* whom the *Arrians* believe to be but a *pure creature.*

§. 3. This is all which needed to have been replyed to the Argument, to ſhow the inconcluſiveneſs of it: but to prevent what I thought was likely to be objected by my Adverſary, I added two things. 1. That *Catholicks are not miſtaken in their belief of the Bread's being changed into the Body of Chriſt, as having the ſame grounds and motives, and a like divine Revelation to believe this, as to believe that Chriſt is God, and conſequently to be adored.* Hereupon *I affirmed that the Doctor's argument, altering only the names, would be of as much force from the pen of an Arrian againſt the Adoration of Chriſt for God, as it was from his own, againſt the Adoration of him in the Euchariſt.* And I think fit to repeat the argument here, for the ſame reaſon, for which the Doctor ſeems unwilling to hear of it. What that was, the Reader will ſee below, §. 5. of this Chapter. The argument as I then propoſed it was this.

The ſame argument which would make the groſſeſt Heathen Idolatry lawful, cannot excuſe any Act from Idolatry; But the ſame argument by which Proteſtants make the worſhip of Chriſt (a pure Man, ſaith the Arrian; I ſhould have ſaid, *creature,* and I thank the Doctor for minding me of it,) *not to be Idolatry, would make the groſſeſt Heathen Idolatry not to be ſo. For if it be not therefore Idolatry, becauſe they ſuppoſe* Chriſt *to be God, then the worſhip of the Sun was not Idolatry by them who ſuppoſed the Sun to be God. 2dly,* I added, *that ſuppoſing* Catholicks *ſhould be miſtaken in their belief, yet Dr.* Taylor *an eminent Man among the Proteſtants, denies it would follow from thence, that they were Idolaters.* And I ſhall repeat his words, when I come to ſpeak to that Point. The Doctor, to make good his Argument againſt theſe Anſwers (which he calls only *appearances of anſwering*) undertakes to prove four things. 1. *That ſuppoſing there were the ſame Revelation of* Chriſt's *Divinity, and of his Preſence in the Euchariſt by Tranſubſtantiation, yet there could not be the ſame reaſon for the Adoration of the Hoſt, as for worſhipping* Chriſt *himſelf.* 2. *That there are not the ſame motives and grounds to believe the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, that there are to believe that* Chriſt *is God.* 3. *That ſuppoſing they are miſtaken in the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation,*

ſubſtantiation, this doth not excuſe them from Idolatry. 4. That the ſame Reaſon which would excuſe them, would excuſe the moſt groſs Idolaters in the World. Theſe are the *heads* of what he *rejoins* in this matter, Great and Glorious things, if they can be made out. But how far the *performance* comes ſhort of the undertaking, will appear by the enſuing Anſwers to the ſeveral *Propoſitions*, and what he brings in proof of them, in order as they lye.

§. 4. The Doctor's firſt Propoſition: *Suppoſing there were the ſame divine Revelation of Tranſubſtantiation,* p. 111. (that is, of Chriſt's Preſence in the Euchariſt, by the change of the Bread into his Body) *and of His Divinity, yet there could not be the ſame reaſon for adoration of the Hoſt, as of Chriſt himſelf.* The firſt thing we are to conſider here, is, what he means by the word *Hoſt*, whether *Chriſt* himſelf under the ſpecies or accidents of Bread: or the *Accidents* themſelves. If he mean *Chriſt* under the Accidents, the Queſtion is, whether the ſame adoration be due to *Chriſt* in the *Sacrament*, as *out* of it? If he mean only the *Accidents*, the Queſtion is, whether the *ſame adoration*, that is, *as much* or *as great* adoration is due to *them* as to *Chriſt* himſelf? The *firſt* he knows is affirmed by us, the *ſecond* denyed, becauſe as was ſaid be-

fore of *Images* (p. 190.) although *Christ* and the Accidents be worſhipped by the *ſame Act* of *Adoration*, yet as conſidered *preciſely* relating to the Accidents, it falls upon them after an *Inferiour manner*. And it became a Generous Adverſary, (as he ſhows himſelf to be, in ſuppoſing the *ſame divine Revelation* for *Chriſt*'s Preſence in the *Euchariſt*, as for his *Divinity*, which he needed not have done) to have told us clearly his meaning in this Point. But this he thought not fit to do, but to blend both *ſenſes* confuſedly together, that when he found himſelf preſs'd in *one*, he might flie for refuge to the *other*. The *Catholick ſenſe* is this, that the *ſame* or as great *adoration is due to Chriſt in the Sacrament, as out of it*. Againſt this he objects two things. 1. That *there is a plain Command in Scripture for the One, and none for the other*. 2. *That the One gives us a ſufficient reaſon for our Worſhip, the other doth not.* To the firſt I anſwer (as he foreſaw very well I would) that *a General Command* (ſuch as thoſe cited by himſelf, *Let all the Angels adore him*, that is, *Chriſt*, Hebr. 1. 6. and *to his Name every Knee is to bow*, Phil. 2. 10.) *doth extend to him wherever he is preſent*: as a like command of honouring *ſuch a Perſon* for *King* would do, wherever he ſhould be known to reſide: And this I take to be *Intimation enough that we are to worſhip Chriſt*

under

under the Accidents ſuppoſing him preſent there. And whereas he ſaith this Anſwer proves *no more his worſhip in them, than in a Turf, or any other piece of bread, becauſe Chriſt*, ſaith he, *being God is every where preſent*, (as if his being *God* made him every where preſent, *as* he is ſuppoſed to be *in the Sacrament*;) This was but an Artifice to divert the Reader from the matter in hand, which is not about the worſhip of *God, as every where preſent*, but *as hypoſtatically* preſent in the *Fleſh*: And ſo the Queſtion between us, is, whether in caſe there be a *general command* to worſhip the *Son* of *God made Man*, we may not as lawfully do it to him (ſuppoſing a divine Revelation, that he is ſo preſent) *in the Sacrament*, as the *Apoſtles* and others adored him, when he was converſant among them? To this Queſtion I Anſwer affirmatively, and he Negatively, unleſs *he can ſee a plain Command to do it to him, as preſent in the Sacrament*. And who can but wonder to ſee *him* now ſo *ſcrupulous* in giveing adoration to *God made Man*, (believing him to be really preſent in the *Hoſt*) unleſs he have an expreſs command to do it; who profeſſes of himſelf (p. 101.) that were he of our mind in the matter of *Images*, he *ſhould not ſtick to offer up the Hoſt it ſelf*, that is, God-Man really preſent under the *Sacramental ſigns*, in Sacrifice to *a block* or a *hewn*

ſtone

ſtone, without any command at all either *general* or *particular* to do it? But to remove this ſcruple, as I have endeavoured to do ſome others, it may ſuffice to tell him, that although *our worſhip be not to be guided by our fancies, but the will of God*; Yet where there is a *general command* without any Exception, to worſhip the *Word made Fleſh*, there he hath given a ſufficient Indication of the lawfulneſs of doing it, wherever we are certain by *Faith* that He is ſo preſent. What particular command had the *Wiſemen* to adore Him in the *Manger*, or the *Thief* upon the *Croſs*? Was it not enough that they had a *Divine Revelation*, that He was the *Son* of *God*, to move them to *adore* Him with Divine Worſhip? Or is he *leſs adorable* under the *Sacramental ſigns*, than bound up in *ſwadling-cloths*, or covered with *blood* and *ſpittle*? Surely it was happy for the *Wiſe-men* and the *Thief*, that they had not Dr. *St.* to direct them what to do. For had they followed his *Caſuiſtry*, they muſt have ſuſpended their Adoration for want of an *Expreſs Command* in their particular caſes.

§. 5. But he had not advanced above a Leaf farther, when it ſeems he perceiv'd the weakneſs of this Anſwer; and therefore to piece it out, he tells us, (p. 115.) that *in caſe of Chriſt's viſible appearance to us in any place*,

place, we need not a particular command in ſuch a caſe to make it lawful to adore him. But that which goes againſt the grain of his *ſenſe* and *reaſon*, is, that he ſhould do it to him under a *Veil*, though he be more certain by *Faith*, that it is *He* that is there preſent, than if he ſaw him with his eyes. This is ſuch a *ſelf-denyal*, as is not to be expected from *fleſh* and *blood*. And if you ask him why there is not *the ſame reaſon of believing Chriſt to be preſent, as ſeeing him?* He anſwers with a *diſtinction* much more ſubtil, than that he alledged out of *Scotland*, for *ſaying the Lord's Prayer to a Saint*, p. 101. that *in matters of pure Revelation, where the matter propos'd to our Faith can be no Object of ſenſe, as Chriſt's Infinite preſence in all places as God; there he may firmly believe, and worſhip Him upon the credit of Divine Revelation: but ſpeaking of the viſible preſence of Chriſt, where honour is given on the account of the divine nature, but he can be known to be preſent only by his Humanity in this caſe I ſay*, ſaith he, (and his *Ipſe dixit* muſt be of no leſs authority than that of *Pythageras*) *I ſay, the evidence of ſenſe is neceſſary in order to the true worſhipping of the Perſon of Chriſt.* Here is indeed an appearance of a diſtinction, but ſuch an one as quite overthrows his whole diſcourſe, for if he ſuppoſe (as he doth at preſent) that the *Humanity* of *Chriſt* is real-

ly

ly preſent in the *Sacrament*, in ſuch a way that it *cannot be the Object of ſenſe*, he muſt rank it among his *matters of pure Revelation*, and ſo not only firmly *believe* it, but alſo give him *worſhip* ſuitable to his preſence. When therefore he tells us the queſtion is concerning the *viſible preſence of Chriſt*, it is manifeſt he either changes the ſtate of the *Queſtion*, or retracts what before he ſo generouſly granted of his *Inviſible* preſence in the *Sacrament*. This then is plain was but to delude the Reader, and not anſwer to the Queſtion, which was, *Why there is not the ſame reaſon for worſhipping Chriſt in the Sacrament, believing him to be there upon the credit of a Divine Revelation, as if we ſaw Him with our eyes.* But to follow him a little in his wandrings, and ſpeak to the *viſible preſence of Chriſt*. *In caſe he can be known to be preſent only by his Humanity, Why muſt the Evidence of ſenſe be neceſſary in order to his worſhip?* Was he not *ſo* preſent in the *Womb* of the *Virgin*, after the *Angels* meſſage? Was he not *ſo* preſent in his *Aſcenſion* after he was intercepted from his Diſciples ſight by a *Cloud*? Was he not *ſo* preſent, before he opened the Eyes of the *two blind Men*, who ſate by the way ſide, *Matth.* 20. 30.? And is he not believed by all *Chriſtians* to be *ſo* preſent at the *right hand* of his *Father*? And might none of theſe *worſhip* him, be-

cauſe

cauſe they could *not ſee* him? If he pretend a difference in the caſes, becauſe in all them he was the *Object of ſenſe* either *before* or *after*: but *as* he exiſts in the *Sacrament* he *can be no Object of ſenſe*; he muſt grant his preſence there to be *a matter of pure Revelation*: and ſo falls upon the other *edge* of his diſtinction, that *in matters of pure Revelation, where the matter propoſed to our Faith can be no Object of ſenſe, there firm credit is to be given to the divine Revelation, and worſhip alſo ſuitable to his preſence.* But to go one ſtep further, In caſe *a thing* be knowable by *evidence of ſenſe*, May it not alſo be made known by *Divine Revelation*? And will not *God's Revelation* aſcertain us as well, if not much better, than *our Eyes*? Who ſaw the *World* riſe out of *nothing*? No leſs a Philoſopher than *Ariſtotle* (not to ſpeak of others) held it never had *any* beginning. And yet what *Chriſtian* does not believe it had, more firmly upon the account of *God's Revelation*, than if he had been preſent in ſome corner of the *ſpatium Imaginarium*, and beheld the foundation of it with his *Eyes*? Upon the whole then, which way ſoever the Doctor turn himſelf, unleſs he will maintain (what he ſeems indeed to *ſuppoſe* all along in this diſcourſe) that we are to give *more credit* to our *ſenſe*, then to *God's revealed word*, he muſt confeſs that

that wherever there is a *Divine Revelation* of *Chriſt*'s preſence, (which at preſent he ſuppoſes *in the Sacrament.*) *there is the ſame*, if not greater *Reaſon, to believe and worſhip him*, than if he *ſaw* him as clearly as the *Wiſe-men* did in the *Manger*, or the *Thief* upon the *Croſs*. And conſequently that he was but too too *Prodigal*, in granting, that *ſuppoſing a like Divine Revelation for Chriſt's preſence in the Euchariſt by Tranſubſtantiation, as for his being true God, yet there would not be the ſame reaſon to worſhip him there*, as when he dwelt viſibly among us. All that he could deviſe to elude the Parallel argument I urged from the Pen of an *Arrian*, Viz. that *the Argument he brings to conclude Catholicks to be Idolaters, for their adoration of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, would be of as much force from the Arrians againſt the adoration of him as God:* All, I ſay, he could deviſe to elude this argument with, ſtanding to the *true ſtate* of the Queſtion, and *ſuppoſing* (as he does) *a like divine Revelation for both*, was to ſay there was not *an expreſs command* to worſhip *him* in the *Euchariſt*; which how pitiful an Evaſion it is, I have ſhewed above. And yet as pitiful as it is, it may ſerve well enough to make an unwary Reader believe, he concludes all the *Papiſts* in the World *Idolaters* for worſhipping *our Lord Chriſt* himſelf *in the Sacrament*. But why it ſhould

do

do ſo, when nothing leſs than *an expreſs Prohibition* could make them *Idolaters* in the matter of *Images*, I cannot imagin.

§. 6. The Second Proof he brings to ſhow that, *Suppoſing a like divine Revelation for Chriſt's being preſent in the Sacrament, as for his being true God, yet there is not the ſame reaſon of adoration*, is p. 112. *becauſe the One*, he ſaith, *gives us a ſufficient reaſon of our Worſhip*, viz. *his Divinity*; *but the other doth not, becauſe all that He* can *believe then preſent, ſuppoſing Tranſubſtantiation, is the Body of Chriſt, and that is not the Object of our Adoration.* But this is altogether as *weak* as the former; for however *that* be all he *can* believe, and more than he *does* believe, (God encreaſe his *Faith.*) yet *Catholicks* believe much more, *viz.* that together with his *Body* in the *Euchariſt* are preſent his *Soul*, his *Perſon*, his *Divinity*, in a word, *whole Chriſt*: and to *his Perſon* it is they *terminate* their *worſhip* as *hypoſtatically* united with his *Body*. For as the *Dr.* himſelf ſaith very well (p. 114.) *although the humane nature of Chriſt, of it ſelf can yield us no ſufficient reaſon of adoration, yet being conſidered as united to the Divine Nature, that cannot hinder the ſame Divine Worſhip being given to his Perſon, which belongs to his Divine Nature, any more than the Robes of a Prince, can take off from the honour due unto him.* To elude this Anſwer (for now

now his chiefeſt hope conſiſts in ſeeking out ways to *eſcape*) inſtead of rejoining to it, upon the ſuppoſition of *Tranſubſtantiation*; he falls to diſpute down-right againſt *Tranſubſtantiation* it ſelf, where he tells the Reader, that this Anſwer of *Chriſt's Body being hypoſtatically united with the Divine Nature, is indeed a good argument to prove the Body of Chriſt cannot be there by Tranſubſtantiation.* And I deſire the Reader to be very attentive to the argument as it is propos'd by the *Doctor*; for otherwiſe perhaps it may coſt him the labour of a ſecond reading. *If the Bread*, ſaith he, p. 113. *be converted into that Body of Chriſt, which is hypoſtatically united with the Divine Nature, then the Converſion is not meerly into the Body, but into the Perſon of Chriſt, and then Chriſt hath as many Bodies hypoſtatically united to him, as there are Elements conſecrated: and ſo all the accidents of the Bread belong to that Body of Chriſt which is hypoſtatically united with the Divine Nature. Therefore the Body of Chriſt cannot be in the Sacrament by Tranſubſtantiation.* This is his argument, which he calls a *Good One*. I am ſure I may call it a *ſublime One*, and *ſo ſublime*, that there wants only an Adverſary of the ſame humour with *Mr. F. S.'s* to ſet it out for a notable piece of new *Myſtical Divinity*.

Dr. *T.* Preface to his Sermons.

vinity. For *I do verily believe that neither Harphius nor Rusbrochius, nor the profound Mother Juliana have any thing in their writings so seemingly un-intelligible*, and *contradictory*, as this discourse of the Doctor's is *really* such. For (beside the hard words of *hypostatical union*, *consecrated Elements*, *Conversion into the Person of Christ*, &c. which quite put down Mr. *F. S.*'s vulgar ones of *Potentiality*, *Actuality*, *Actuation*, *supervene subsume*, &c.) *First*, He will have it to be the *same Body*, because it is *that Body which is hypostatically united with the divine nature*. Then he will have it *not* to be the *same Body*, because *Christ would have as many Bodies, as there are Elements consecrated*. And then again it must be the *same Body*, because *all the Accidents of Bread belong to that Body, which is hypostatically united with the Divine Nature*. But this way of refining a discourse into *Mystical Divinity* is proper only to confute *demonstrations*; and the argument I have to deal with is so far from that, that it carries not the show of a *Probability*. For if the *Bread* be converted into *that Body* of *Christ* which is *hypostatically* united with the *divine nature*, and not meerly into *that*, but into the *Person of Christ*, does it follow that *he hath as many Bodies hypostatically united to him as there are Elements consecrated?* No more, than because the *Bread*, the *Flesh*, the

Fish which he eat upon Earth, were *converted* into the *substance* of his *Body*, and *hypostatically* united to him, it follows, that he had *as many bodies hypostatically* united to him, as there were *several meats* eaten by him. Before *Digestion* or *Conversion* they were distinct; by *Conversion* they were made the *same body*. But if this will not serve the turn, he wants not a *false supposition*, to blind his Reader with, *Viz.* that *we make the Elements, i. e.* the Accidents of Bread, (*for we we will have nothing else remain after Consecration, in sight*, he says, *of all the reason and sense of the World.*) *the Object of divine worship*. But the *falsity* of this *supposition* I shall make appear in the next Chapter; together with his *mistake* (if it be no more) of the meaning of the *Council* of *Trent*.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

The true State of the Controversy laid open, together with the Doctor's Endeavours to misrepresent it. His manner of arguing against the Adoration of Christ in the Eucharist, equally destructive to the adoration of Him, as God.

§. 1. IN pursuance of his former design, my Adversary will now undertake
p. 114. to prove yet further, that *upon the Principles of the Roman Church, no Man can be assured, that he doth not commit Idolatry every time he gives adoration to the Host. And this he hopes will abundantly add to the discovering of the disparity between the worship given to the Person of Christ, and that which is given to the Eucharist upon supposition of Transubstantiation.* But before he can come to this *he must* needs *mistake*, or rather *misstate* the Controversy, which he does in most ample manner; when after a great many *Preambles* for three whole Pages together, to no more to the purpose, than the *Flourishes* of a great *Text-letter* are to the force of a *Hand*, he tells the Reader at length that the *state of the Controversy between us, is, whether*

proper divine worſhip may be given to the Elements, (i. e. the *Accidents*) *on account of Chriſt's corporal preſence under them?* But, (whatever *Divines* diſpute concerning the *Worſhip* of the *Accidents*) *the Object of Catholicks Adoration* (as Dr. *Taylor* ingenuouſly confeſſes) *Viz.* (*What is repreſented to them in their mind, their thoughts and purpoſes*) *in the B. Sacrament, is the only true and Eternal God hypoſtatically joined with his Holy Humanity*: And conſequently the Queſtion between us, is, *Whether ſuppoſing our Lord Chriſt to be really preſent under the Sacramental ſigns, the ſame proper divine worſhip be not to be given to him there which is due to his Perſon, wherever it is preſent by hypoſtatical union with his ſacred Humanity?* Let the Doctor do thus, and we have no quarrel with him; which is an evident ſign, that the Queſtion between us, is not, as he ſays, whether the ſame Adoration ought to be given to the *Accidents*, which we would give to the very Perſon of *Chriſt?* But what may not he venture to ſay, who had the confidence to advance ſo *notorious a calumny*, as that it is our *common anſwer* in this matter, to excuſe our ſelves from Idolatry, that *we believe the Bread to be God?* I told the Reader what he was like to find neer the bottom of the *Sack*, when he met with

Lib. of Proph. *ſect.* 20. *n.* 26.

with ſuch ſophiſtical Ware at the very top. But the Doctor pretends he hath ſomething to ſay here in his defence: and it is this, that the *Council* of *Trent* hath expreſly determin'd *Seſſ.* 13. *c.* 5. that *there is no manner of doubt left, but that all Chriſtians ought to give the ſame worſhip to this Holy Sacrament, which they give to God himſelf. For it is not therefore leſs to be worſhipped, becauſe it was Inſtituted by Chriſt our Lord, that it might be taken.* But who tells him that the *Council* here by the word *Sacrament* means only the *Signs* or *Accidents* of *Bread?* Why may it not mean *the Holy Victime which is diſpenſed from the Altar*, as St. *Auſtin* did, when he ſaid that his Mother St. *Monica had tied her Soul faſt to this Sacrament by the bond of Faith?* If the *Council* may be allowed to explicate its own meaning, we ſhall find the *ſenſe* of the word to be, the *Body* of *Chriſt*, and with it *his Divinity*, under the *Sacramental* Veil: for, the reaſon it gives in the words immediately following, (which the Doctor conveniently leaves out) of this adoration, is, *becauſe we believe the ſame God to be preſent in it, of whom the Eternal Father ſaid, Let all the Angels of God adore him.* And this is yet more plain from the *6th. Canon*, where the *Anathema* is denounced againſt thoſe, *who ſhall ſay, that in the moſt*

H. Sacrament of the Eucharist, the only begotten of God is not to be adored with the worship of Latria. But let the *Council* say what it will, Dr. *St.* says, that *by the Sacrament it must understand the Elements or Accidents, as the Immediate term of that divine worship, or else the latter words*, [that the Sacrament ought not less to be adored, because it was instituted to be taken] *signify nothing at all.* And why so? Do *Catholicks* understand nothing by the *Sacrament*, but the *Accidents!* Or was nothing *instituted* to be *taken*, but the *bare signs* of *Bread* and *Wine?* Dr. *St.* is, or would be, an Author of great Authority; and from his own Confession we have it, (p. 114.) *that the Holy Sacrament according to Catholicks is the Body of Christ under the Accidents of Bread.* These are his own words: and if he will not believe the *Council*, let him believe himself, whether he do so, or no, when proceeding upon his supposition, that *proper divine worship is to be given to the Accidents*, he affirms, (p. 118.) that *this is not denied, that he knows of by any who understand the Doctrine or Practise of the Roman Church*, I leave to the Reader to judg, when he shall have heard what *Bellarmin*, an Author not unacquainted with the *Doctrin* and *Practise* of the *Church*, says in this matter. *There is not*, saith he, *any one Catho-*

Bellarm. de Euch. li. 4. c. 29.

Catholick, who teaches that the External Symbols per se, (that is, absolutely) and *properly are to be adored with the worship of Latria, but only to be reverenced with a certain inferiour worship, which is due to all Sacraments. What we affirm is, that Christ is properly and per se to be adored with the worship of Latria, and that this adoration belongs also to the Symbols of Bread and Wine, under which he is contained, as they are apprehended united with him, in such manner as those who adored him apparel'd upon Earth, did not adore him alone, but quodammodo, in a certain kind his Garments also.* For neither were they so scrupulous, *as to require him to put off his cloths, before they adored him, nor yet to separate him in thought from them, at the time of adoration; but worshipped him absolutely, as then he was.* And then a little after, *whatever difference,* saith he, *there may be among Divines about the manner of speaking, the Question is no other, but whether Christ be to be adored with divine worship in the Eucharist?* This is what *Bellarmin* says; And, if the Doctor would not except against an Example from *civil worship*, I should tell him, that his stating the Controversy between us, concerning the adoration of *Christ* in the *Eucharist*, to be, *whether the Accidents be to be adored with proper Divine Worship which is due to God alone?* is just as if a *Quaker* should make the Que-

ſtion between *him* and a *Proteſtant* concerning the worſhip of the *King* in his *Robes* to be, whether the *Robes* are to be worſhipped with the ſame Regal worſhip which is due only to the *King's Perſon?* The ſubtilty, (ſuch as it is) is Parallel in both: Only the Doctor hath the fortune to be *applauded* for what the poor *Quaker* would be laughed at, and hiſs'd out of the Court.

I cannot doubt but the Doctor (who is ſo well vers'd in *Bell.* as his *Objections* ſhow) had read theſe paſſages in him, when he ſubjoins, that *Catholicks* to *anſwer* their *adverſaries* arguments, *would ſeem to direct their worſhip only to Chriſt, as under the Elements or Accidents*; a pretty *ſelf-conviction*, if well obſerv'd, for who ſhould we believe for the Doctrin and practiſe of *Catholicks* but themſelves? But what he adds, *that they yield, that on the account of this corporal preſence, that which appears ought to have the ſame worſhip given to it with that which is ſuppoſed or believed*, is ſufficiently convinced by what hath been cited out of *Bellarmin*, in that *abſolute ſenſe* in which the Doctor charges it upon us, to be a *meer calumny*, (as *Bellarmin* calls it) for although he affirm, that when *Chriſt* is worſhipped under the *Symbols*, that *adoration* belongs alſo to the *Symbols*, yet he ſays it is, *in ſuch manner, as the adoration given to him upon Earth in his apparel belonged*

to

to his Garments; which he qualifies with a *quodammodo, after a certain manner*; that is to ſay, *not as it is given to Chriſt himſelf*, but in an *inferiour* manner, as hath been above declared, *Part* 1. *chap.* 10. *p.*190.

§. 2. After all this turning and winding to miſ-repreſent the ſtate of the Controverſy to be, *whether on the account of Chriſt's corporal preſence in the Sacrament, that which appears* (viz. the accidents of bread) *ought to have the ſame worſhip given to it with that which is ſuppoſed or believed*, that is, with Chriſt himſelf; He comes at length to ſhow, *that upon the Principles of the Roman Church no Man can be aſſured, that he doth not commit Idolatry every time he gives adoration to the Hoſt.* To prove this, he makes uſe of a double *Medium.* The firſt, *That no Man can be ſecure that the Object is ſuch as doth deſerve divine worſhip.* The ſecond, *That no Man can be ſatisfied, that he hath a ſufficient reaſon for giving this worſhip to the Hoſt.* And they are both of them impertinent to the preſent purpoſe, and quite overthrow his ſuppoſition: for proceeding upon the *Principles* of the *Roman Church*, and ſuppoſing (as he doth at preſent) *a divine Revelation for the preſence of Chriſt true God and Man in the Sacrament*, he muſt either deny *Chriſt* himſelf to be *adorable*, or he muſt grant, that the *Object doth deſerve Divine Worſhip, and that there is ſufficient*

cient reaſon to give it. He that is too Prodigal in giving away, what in time he may need himſelf, caſts himſelf upon a neceſſity either of *begging* what he gave, or pretending an *Error* in the *Deed* of *Gift*. And to theſe ſtraits hath the Doctor brought himſelf, by his over-liberality in *ſuppoſing a like divine Revelation for Chriſt's preſence in the Sacrament, as for his being true God.* His *honour* will not permit him to *begg*, what he ſo freely granted; and therefore he takes the other courſe of pretending a *double flaw* in the *donation:* and although his pretences be excluded by the very *evidence* of the *deed*, as it ſtands upon Record in his own Book, *p.* 111. yet I ſhall give them the hearing, and ſhow them to have nothing at all of *proof* in them.

1. He ſaith, *p.* 120. *No Man can be ſecure, that the Object is ſuch as doth deſerve divine worſhip:* If you ask him why? He tells you, *the Maſs-Bell now rings*, the Hoſt is to be adored, *and if he ſhould chance to believe his ſenſes, or harken to his reaſon, he becomes an Idolater by not being a Fool or a Mad-man.* Again, if he conſider the miraculouſneſs of the *change*; *it is ſo ſtrange and ſudden, he can hardly ſay that God becoming Man was ſo great a wonder, as a little piece of Bread becoming God.* If he be recall'd from *carnal Reaſon to the Words of Chriſt, this is my body,*

he

he is told that Scripture is very obſcure, and dangerous for any one to be too confident of the ſenſe of it; If he be ſent for the meaning of it to the *unanimous conſent of the Fathers*; *he ſees the World is as full of diſputes concerning the ſenſe of their words, as of the Scriptures. Laſtly*, If he be *counſel'd* to lay aſide his *ſcruples*, and ſubmit *to the authority of the preſent Church, he finds that Catholicks are not agreed about that neither*: Some think it enough, that it is *defined* by the *Pope*; Others require the concurrence of a *General Council*, and that it be confirmed *wholly* by the *Pope*, and doth proceed in the *way of a Council. So that he ſees he may ſpend all his life in the ſtudy and ſearch of theſe things, and yet never be ſatisfied in them*, nor conſequently in Tranſubſtantiation it ſelf, which is now the Point he pretends *he is not ſatisfied in*: wherefore if *this be the only way of ſatisfaction, he muſt forbear giving adoration, or be guilty of Idolatry in doing it*. And doth he not manifeſtly prove himſelf here to be in the caſe of the *Prodigal* I lately mentioned, when *ſuppoſing a like divine Revelation of the preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, as of his being true God*, he now ſpends no leſs than four whole Pages to prove *that he cannot be ſatisfied there is any ſuch Revelation?* Let *Schollars* judge of this *illiberal* manner of proceeding, whilſt I ſpeak to the Argument

ment it self. And, (not to tire the Reader with particular Reflexions upon the several difficulties he starts concerning the *evidence* of his *sense*, the *miraculousness* of the *change*, the *obscurity* of *Scripture*, the *consent* of the *Fathers*, which have been answered over and over by *Catholick* Writers,) to free my self from all scruples in the case, *I take the Authority of the present Church to be sufficient for me.* For however some *Divines* think it enough, that it be *defined* by the *Pope* who is *Head* of the *Church*; Others require the *concurrence* of a *General Council*; and that this *General Council* be *wholly confirmed by the Pope, and doth proceed in the way of a Council:* Yet I am sure that none of these are wanting in the point of *Transubstantiation.* For it hath been *defined* long ago both by *Popes* and *Councils*, and received as *lawfully defined* by the whole *Church Catholick*, that *our Lord Christ* is truly and really present in the *Sacrament*, by the *conversion* of the *Elements* into his *Body* and *Blood*; and therefore (for any thing the Doctor hath said in this matter) I may *securely* give the same *proper divine worship* to *him there*, which is due to his *Person*, without fear of *Idolatry.*

§. 3. But because the Doctor professes that the *end* why he took this way, was *a hope he had, that it would abundantly add to the di-*

discovering the disparity between the worship given to the Person of Christ, and that which is given to the Eucharist upon supposition of Transubstantiation. I shall in the next Place shew, how he hath failed of this *End*; and there will need no more to do it, but to suppose a *Socinian* to take up his own argument, and retort it upon him in the point of the *worship* of *Christ*, as *God*. And if he approve not my Answer for good, it will be expected from him to give a better. Behold then a *Socinian* proposing the argument in Dr. *St.*'s own *Mood* and *Figure*. The *chimes* now ring all in to *Church*, where I must give the same *divine worship* to *Christ*, as to the *Eternal Father*. But stay (saith the *Socinian*) how can I be secure, that *the Object is such as deserves divine worship? If I should chance to believe my senses, and hearken to my reason*, which can discover nothing in him, but his *Humanity*; *I become an Idolater by not being a Fool, or a Mad man.* Again, if I consider the *miraculous union* of the *Divine* and *Humane* Nature in one *Person*; it seems *more strange* to me, that *Man* should be *God* than, what the *Papists* say, that *Bread* should be *converted* into his *Body*. *Must I rely on the bare words of Christ, I and the Father are One*; but I am told by no less a Man than St. *Peter*, that there are *certain things in Scripture hard to be* 2 Pet. 3. 16.

under-

understood, which the unlearned and unstable deprave to their own perdition, and therefore it must needs be *dangerous for me to be too confident of the sense of it*, in so difficult a point. I have heard there have been great disputes concerning the meaning of *those words* among the *Primitive Christians*; And *What a case am I in then, if those words do not prove it?* Must I have recourse for the interpretation of them to the *unanimous consent of the Fathers? Alas, what relief is this to my anxious mind! For I see the World is full of disputes concerning the sense of their words, as well as the Scriptures.* And I have heard of a late Author, one *Christopherus Sandius*, who in a Set-Treatise contends that the greatest part of those *Fathers*, who are esteemed *Orthodox*, deny the *Son* to be *consubstantially* One with the *Father*. *In this great confusion, what ground of certainty have I to stand upon, whereby to secure my mind from the Commission of a great sin? While I am in this Labyrinth, behold a kind Catholick offers to give me ease, and tells me these are doubts and scruples, I ought not to trouble my self about: The Authority of the present Church is sufficient for me. But how shall I know what he means by the Authority of the present Church. For I find Catholicks themselves are not agreed about that neither. May I be sure, if the Pope, who is Head of the Church say it? No,*

not unleſs he defines it? But may I be ſure then? No, not unleſs a General Council concur. But may I be ſure if a General Council determins it? Yes, if it be confirmed wholly by the Pope, and doth proceed in the way of a Council: But how is it poſſible for me to judge of that, when the intrigues of actions are ſo ſecret: I ſee then, if this, or any of theſe, *be the only way of ſatisfaction, I muſt forbear giving the ſame adoration to Chriſt, as to the Father, or be guilty of Idolatry in doing it.* Behold here the Doctor's argument return'd upon himſelf; and if it have any *force* againſt the adoration of *Chriſt* in the *Euchariſt*, it muſt have the *ſame* againſt the worſhip of *Him* as *God*. And what a caſe is *Chriſtianity* in, if it depend upon his *ſolving* his own *Argument*? But his *ſcruples* are not yet at an *End*.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Of Dr. St.'s Scruple about the Hoſt's not being conſecrated, for want of Intention in the Prieſt; and His miſtake of the true Reaſon of giving Adoration to Chriſt in the Sacrament.

§. 1. THE Doctor's next Scruple is about the *Prieſt's* Intention, or rather *not Intention* to Conſecrate; and I confeſs I never met with any Man ſo *unevenly ſcrupulous*, as he is; that is, ſo *reſolute* in ſome caſes, (*were he of our mind*) as *in ſaying his Prayers to the Sun*, and *offering up the Hoſt to an Image*: and yet ſo *timorous* in others, as in this of not daring to *adore Chriſt* himſelf, (*were he of our mind in the Point of Tranſubſtantiation*) as ſuppoſed preſent in the *Sacrament*, for fear the *Hoſt* ſhould not be conſecrated through *defect* or *malice* of the *Prieſt*. Suppoſe, ſaith he, (p. 123.) *I am ſatisfied in the Point of Tranſubſtantiation*, (by which you ſee he ſet himſelf to fight againſt it at the ſame time that he told us he would ſuppoſe it) *it is not enough for me to know in general, that there is ſuch a change, but I muſt believe particularly that very*

Bread

Bread to be changed ſo, which I am to worſhip; And by what means can I be ſure of that? It is a very *evil* thing to be troubled with too many *ſcruples:* While the *mind* is perplexed with *them*, the *tongue* runs unawares into *Contradictions*. What is it elſe to ſay, that *he is to worſhip that very Bread which he muſt believe to be changed?* What *common ſenſe* will charge him to honour *that*, which he muſt believe *not* to be *there?* This hath a reliſh of the old Leaven, that *Catholicks believe the Bread to be God:* And I ſee a *cuſtome* of any thing, though it be *ſelf-contradiction* will turn by degrees into a *ſecond nature*. But to let this paſs, and attend to his ſcruple. Here he would ſeem to return again to his former ſuppoſition of a *like divine Revelation for Chriſt's Preſence in the Euchariſt by Tranſubſtantiation, as for his being true God*: but in reality he does but ſeem to do it. For from his whole diſcourſe, (p. 111. &c.) where he ſuppoſes the ſame divine Revelation for Tranſubſtantiation, as for *Chriſt's Divinity*, it is evident he ſpeaks not only of *Tranſubſtantiation* in *general*, but alſo in *particular*. What means elſe his firſt Proof, (p. 111.) that *there is a plain command in Scripture for adoring Chriſt himſelf, but not the leaſt intimation given that we are to worſhip Him in the Elements, ſuppoſing Him preſent there*. And again, what means his 2*d*.

Proof, (p. 112.) that *the one gives us a ſufficient reaſon of our worſhip*, viz. *that he is the Eternal Son of God; but the other doth not, ſuppoſing the Bread to be really converted into the Body of Chriſt?* Who ſees not here that the ſuppoſition is of the *real* and *undoubted* preſence of *Chriſt* by the change of the Bread into his Body? and that he does but endeavour, to *take back* by *parcels*, what he unwarily gave away in the *lump*, when he raiſes doubts and ſcruples about the certainty of the change of *this* or *that particular Bread?* But let him *contradict* himſelf never ſo much, it makes nothing for us. *We muſt be guilty of Idolatry every time we hear Maſs*, unleſs we can be *ſure* that there is a *change* made of the *bread* into the *Body* of *Chriſt* in that *very particular Hoſt*, which is to be *worſhipped*. *And by what means can we be ſure of that?* For, *the Church*, ſaith he, (p. 124.) *having declared that it is neceſſary, that he that conſecrates be a Prieſt, and that he have an intention of conſecrating; if either the Conſecrator ſhould chance to be no Prieſt, becauſe not rightly baptized (which is no unheard of thing) or not have an intention to conſecrate, they who worſhip the Hoſt, muſt be guilty of Idolatry every time he celebrates.* This is the mighty *ſcruple* which torments his mind, and although the abſurdneſs of the *Aſſertion*, that *another* Man's *defect* or *wickedneſs* ſhould make me incur the

the crime of *Idolatry* whether I will or no, might ſuffice to make any reaſonable Man to depoſe ſo chimærical a ſcruple, yet becauſe he will not or cannot do it, I would ask him, what kind of certainty it is he would have? If no leſs than *certainty* of *Faith*, or *evidence* of *ſenſe* will ſerve his turn, I would ask again, what like *certainty* hath a Child or a Husband that *thoſe* Perſons whom *they* take, the *one* for his *Father*, the *other* for his *Wife* are ſo in very deed? I cannot believe him ſo *rigid* a *Caſuiſt*, as neither to permit a *child* to do his duty to his Mother's Husband, till he have a *Divine Revelation* that he is his *true Father*; nor a *Husband* to pay the conjugal debt, unleſs he firſt have as much *evidence* as *ſenſe* can give him, that *Lia* is not put in the place of *Rachel*: and when that is done, perhaps a *Divine Revelation* may be neceſſary to know whether ſhe be *not married* before to *another* Man; for *this* alſo is *no unheard of thing*. Who might not ſay here, as the *Diſciples* did on another occaſion, Matth. 19. 10. *If the caſe of a Man with his Wife be ſo, it is not expedient to marry?* But as I ſaid before, I cannot believe the *Doctor* will be ſo *rigid* in this Point. But why then muſt *we* be tyed up from giving worſhip to *Chriſt*, as preſent in *this* or *that particular Hoſt*, unleſs we be certain either by *evidence* of *ſenſe* or by *Divine Revelation*, that it is

truly consecrated? If the want of *such* a *certainty* ought to make us suspend our Worship, I am sure the want of the like for *true disposition*, ought to make the *Communicant* forbear *receiving*. But if he speak of *such a certainty*, as is usually found in the aforesaid *humane Actions*, and others of the like nature; why may not *this* suffice as well to secure *Christians* from sinning in their *adoration*, as those *other* Persons in paying their *respective duties?* Doth it happen oftner that a *Person* supposed to be a *Priest* is no *Priest*, (*because not rightly baptized*,) than that a *Person* supposed to be a *Father* is not the *Man?* Or doth it happen oftner, that a *Priest cheats* the People by having *no intention* to consecrate, than that a light Houswife *wheadles* a *second* Man to marry her, while her *Husband* unknown to him is yet alive? It is not in the *nature* of *Man* to sin so frequently out of *pure malice*, as it is upon the account of some *profit* or *pleasure* thence resulting. Why then must *we* be more guilty of *Idolatry* (though the *Host* through *defect*, or *Malice* on the *Priest*'s side should happen not to be *truly* consecrated) than *such* a Person is of *Adultery*, or a *Child* of *undutifulness* for having their own *good Intentions* abus'd by the *malice* of others? *Wantonness* may make a *Wife* forget *her* duty; but doth not make a *Child* criminal in doing *his*, to *him* whom he believes

believes to be his *Father*; And the *wickedness* of a *Priest* (as there was one *Judas* among the *Twelve*) may make him a *Devil*: but that cannot make me an *Idolater*. For whilst my *Adoration* is directed *not* to the *Bread*, which I suppose *not* to be *there*, but to the *Person* of *Jesus Christ* true *God*, whom I firmly believe to be in every *Host duly consecrated*, and have not the least reasonable cause to suspect other at present, the *Action* on my part hath all that is requisite to make it *good* and *lawful*; and is so far from being *Idolatry*, that it is a *real honouring* of *Christ*, and will be so accepted. When *Hephastion* was honoured by a mistake for *Alexander*, that great *Prince* was so far from condemning the Person as a *Traytor*, that he took the *honour* as done to himself. And in case those *Gentiles* who were so desirous to *see* our *Saviour*, Jo. 12. 21. had either for want of a Guide to direct them to the *Person*, or by the treacherous malice of a *Judas* prostrated themselves at the *Feet* of some *other*: what reasonable Man would have condemned them for Idolaters? And yet we poor unfortunate *Roman Catholicks*, if it should chance at any time to happen, that either the *Priest* be *no* true one, or *have no intention to consecrate*, though *our Intentions* be never so sincere to adore only our *Lord Jesus Christ*, must stand condemned of *down-*

right Idolatry, for ſo the Doctor calls it (p.124.) and that without any Proof at all, but the old *Ipſe dixit*, that *without the Intention of the Prieſt in conſecrating, it can be nothing elſe.*

§. 2. The ſecond *Medium* he takes (p.125) to prove that *upon the Principles of the Roman Church no Man can be aſſured, that he doth not commit Idolatry every time he gives adoration to the Hoſt*, is, *that no Man can be ſatisfied that he hath ſufficient reaſon for giving this worſhip to it.* And the ſubſtance of the reaſon he gives, is, becauſe *if I worſhip Chriſt*, ſaith he, *in the Sacrament, it is upon account of his corporal preſence, and he finds it generally agreed by the Doctors of the Roman Church, that the humane Nature of Chriſt conſidered alone, ought not to have divine honour given to it; and hotly diſputed among them, whether Chriſt's humane nature, though united to the divine, ought abſtractedly conſidered, to have any true divine honour given it.* And what will he infer from hence? That therefore he cannot be ſatisfied, that he hath ſufficient reaſon for giving true *divine* honour to the *humane nature* of *Chriſt conſidered alone, or abſtractedly, in the Sacrament?* Much good may it do him. But what is this to the purpoſe? Do *Catholicks* adore the *Humanity* of *Chriſt alone*, or *abſtractedly* in the *Sacrament?* Do they *ſeparate*, or *abſtract* in their minds and thoughts

thoughts his *Body* from his *Perſon*, when they *adore* him there? No more than the *Wiſe-men* did, when they *adored* him in the *Manger*, or the *Apoſtles*, when they *adored* him after his *Reſurrection*; Or, than he is *adored* now at the *right hand* of his *Father*. All thoſe *Preciſions* and *Conſiderations* the Doctor ſpeaks of, are only in the Heads of the *Schoolmen*, when they are *diſputing*, not in the minds of *Chriſtians*, when they are *adoring*. The *Object* they *adore*, whether in the *Sacrament*, or out of it, is the only-begotten *Son* of *God* made *Man*, without *ſeparating* or *abſtracting* one *nature* from *another*, any more than we do the *King's Body* from his *Soul*, when we worſhip him. And as Mr. *Thorndike* very well obſerves, *whoſoever propoſeth not to himſelf the conſideration of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, as it is of it ſelf, and in it ſelf a meer Creature (which he that doth not on purpoſe cannot do) cannot but conceive it, as he believes it to be, being a Chriſtian:* And conſequently the *primary reaſon* of his *adoration*, is the *divinity* there preſent. I, but ſays the Doctor, *when I worſhip Chriſt as in the Sacrament, I muſt worſhip him there upon the account of his bodily preſence, for I have no other reaſon, to worſhip him in the Sacrament, but becauſe his Body is preſent in it.* And what may

Epil. 3. part. p. 350.

this mean? Have the *Niceties* and *Precisions* of the *Schools* so perplex'd his understanding, that he hath lost the very *first Notions* of *Christianity*? Is it not *Christ's Body*? Are they not the very words of *Christ*, *This is my Body*? And is not *Christ true God*? How comes it to pass then that he hath *no other reason* to *worship* him in the *Sacrament*, *but because his Body is present in it*? This indeed is the reason why his *Divinity*, as *hypostatically* united to his *Humane Nature*, is *present* in the *Sacrament*; but the *reason* of his being *adored* there is his *Divinity*, and not his *Body*. Philosophy tells us, that it is *one* thing that makes a Man to be in a *place*, and *another*, that makes him to be *worshipped* in that place: and yet he would not be worshipped *there* for this *latter*, unless he were present by vertue of the *former*. The speculation may not seem so clear to such as are not vers'd in the *Schools*; but an example will make it plain. There is a *Preacher* in the World much *admired* and *honoured* by his *Party* in the *Pulpit*. That which makes him to be *present there*, (or is the *reason* of his *presence* there,) is his *Quantity* or *Bodily Dimensions*; but what he is *admired* for and *honoured*, is his *Wit*, his *Eloquence*, his *Zeal* against *Papists*, &c. These are the *Qualities* for which I hear he is applauded, and I easily believe it. But if *my Adversaries* dis-

course

courſe be good (whom I take to have as *much Eloquence*, and to be of *as* ſubtil a *wit*, and of as flaming a *Zeal* as the other) I muſt tell his Admirers they are in a very great Errour, as to the *reaſon* of their *admiration:* and I doubt not but to make it appear upon his own Principles. For I find it *generally agreed* by all the *old Philoſophers*, and by the *Doctors* alſo at preſent of *both Univerſities*, that *Quantity*, or *corporal dimenſion*, conſidered *alone*, ought not to have *civil worſhip* given to it: and I find it very uncertain, whether the *Body* it ſelf though *united* to the *Soul*, ought, *abſtractedly* conſidered, to have any *true civil honour* given it. But I am *moſt certain* that the *only reaſon* why he is *preſent* in the *Pulpit*, is his *Quantity* or *Bodily dimenſions*; Therefore if they will *honour* or *admire* him in the *Pulpit*, it muſt be upon the account of his *bodily preſence*, or *corporal dimenſions*; and not for thoſe other great *parts* and *abilities* for which they have hitherto *admired* him in that place; for if they conſider well, they *have no other reaſon to honour him, as in the Pulpit, but becauſe his Body is preſent in it.* And I am of Opinion, that if any thing can cure them of their *Error*, it will be the Parallel Argument, he brings againſt the worſhip of *Chriſt* in the *Sacrament*. Viz. that becauſe worſhip muſt be given him there upon the account of his

bodily

bodily presence, as the *condition* why his *divinity* as *united* with his *humane Nature* is *there* present; Therefore his *Bodily Presence* and *not* his *Divinity* united to it, must be the *reason* of *adoration*. As for what he adds, (p. 127.) *That supposing Transubstantiation his Divinity should be there in a particular manner present to no End*; I suppose he means by that *particular manner*, the *hypostatical union* with his *humane nature* wherever it is: And doth it not well become a *Master* in *Israel* to affirm that *such a presence* of the *Divinity* would be to no end, when and where himself supposes the *Body* of *Christ* to be *really* and *substantially* present? There wants but one step more, to deny that the *hypostatical union* of the *Divine Nature* to the *Humane* was necessary at all, either for *Christ*'s offering himself upon the *Cross*, or *now* at the *right hand* of his *Father*; for although the *Ceremony* of offering him upon the *Altar* be performed by the *Priest*, yet *Christ* himself is there also both *Offerer* and *Oblation*, *Priest* and *Victim*, as the *Fathers* teach. [S. *Greg. Niss. Orat.* 1. *de Resurr.* S. *Ambr.* in *Ps.*31.1. *Chrysost. Ho.*24. in 1. *ad Cor.*] Well, but the *Divinity of Christ makes not the least manifestation of it self in the Sacrament* to our carnal senses; And must this hinder us from giving him the *worship* due to his *Person*? Is it not enough that we

know

know *Him* to be there by *divine Revelation*, as the Doctor at preſent *ſuppoſes* we do? What other *manifeſtation* had the *Divinity* of *Chriſt* made of it ſelf to the *Baptiſt*, when before the appearing of the *Holy Ghoſt* he refuſed to Baptize him? An evident ſign that he *reverenc'd him* as the *Son* of *God*, Matth. 3.13,14. Did not our *Saviour* himſelf, when St. *Peter* confeſſed him to be *Chriſt the Son of the living God*, declare that *Fleſh and Blood had not revealed this to him, but his Father which is in Heaven?* And upon that very account pronounce Him *Bleſſed? Matt.16.17.* But it ſeems the *Bleſſing* is now *revers'd*, and inſtead of *Bleſſed are they that have not ſeen, and yet have believed*, Jo. 20. 29. We muſt now ſay, *Bleſſed are they who will not believe unleſs they ſee*, Dr. *St.* p. 561. *n.* 5. And what will the end of this be, but the baniſhing *Faith* and *Chriſtianity* out of the World?

§. 3. After all theſe endeavours to wreſt out of our hands the *ſuppoſition* he ſo freely granted (p. 110.) of *the ſame Revelation for Chriſt's Preſence in the Euchariſt, as for his Divinity*, he would bring the buſineſs at laſt to a Compoſition, *if we will beg of him to yield that the Body of Chriſt being preſent, his Divinity is there preſent too.* And I am not ſo nice, (if it will come no *cheaper* way) as not to *begg* it of him, for *Chriſtianity's ſake*: but then

then he adds that even upon this ſuppoſition, that *Chriſt's Divinity is preſent with his Body in the Sacrament*, (p. 127.) *his mind muſt ſtill unavoidably reſt unſatisfied as to the Adoration of the Hoſt. For, ſuppoſing the divine Nature preſent in any thing gives no ground upon that account, to give the ſame worſhip to the thing wherein he is preſent, as I do to Chriſt himſelf.* But here again he relapſes into his former *miſtake* of the *Controverſy*, which (in ſpight of the *practiſe* of *Catholicks*, which is to adore *Chriſt* under the *Accidents*, in like *manner* as he was *worſhipped* in his *Apparel*,) he will have to be, that *proper divine worſhip is to be given to the Accidents*: For, this is what he means here by the *Hoſt*. Let him ſtate the Queſtion as it ought to be, that is, *Whether Chriſt may not be worſhipped under the Accidents as well as in his Garments?* Or (if he will needs mix the *Queſtions* of the *Schools* with thoſe of *Faith*) *Whether the Accidents may not be worſhipped together with Chriſt, in like manner as his Garments were worſhipped together with Him?* And the Controverſy will quickly be at an End. But, (not to tire the Reader with following him in his Repetitions) his *ſcruple*, if I miſtake not, at preſent, is, why, *ſuppoſing the divine nature preſent in any thing gives no ground to worſhip every thing in which he is preſent*; yet his *preſence* in the *Euchariſt* ſhould be a *ſuffi-*

cient

cient reason to worſhip the *Accidents* toge-
ther with him? And
to this I give *Bellar-* *lib. 4. de Euch. c. 30.*
min's anſwer, (which
I take alſo to be the ſenſe of *Greg. de Va-*
lentia, in the place cited by the Doctor.)
Longe aliter Chriſtus eſt in Euchariſtia, &c.
*That Chriſt is in the Euchariſt in a far differ-
ent manner, than God is in other things. For
in the Euchariſt there is but one only Suppoſi-
tum, and that divine: All other things there
preſent belong to that, and in a certain manner
make one with that, though not in the ſame
manner.* (mark that) *Hence it is that the
whole is rightly worſhipped together, as we ſaid
before of Chriſt apparell'd. But although God
be in all other things, yet not ſo, that he is
one Suppoſitum with them, nor is there ſuch an
Union between God and the Creature, in which
he is, that they can be ſaid to be in a manner
One.* By this it appears, that as *Greg. de*
Valentia deſervedly calls *this preſence* of
Chriſt to the Accidents, *an admirable Con-
junction*, ſo the Doctor unjuſtly *impoſes* up-
on *Bellarmin*, that *he grants as great an hy-
poſtatical union between Chriſt and the Acci-
dents, as between the divine and humane Na-
ture*; for although *Bellarmin* ſay, that *all
things there preſent, in a certain manner make
One with the Suppoſitum*, yet he declares ex-
preſly, *that it is not in the ſame manner.* But

here

here the Doctor complains of *un-intelligible terms and notions* used in this matter; And might he not do the same with as much reason of the *terms* and *Notions* used by the *School-men* in explicating the *mysteries* of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*? How *un-intelligible* soever the *School-terms* appear to him, yet it is *very easy* to understand that neither *Greg. de Valentia*, nor *Bellarmin* mean to give *divine honour* to the *Accidents* for themselves; and yet much *easier* to understand what *Christian* People mean, when they profess, the *Object* of their *Adoration* in the *Eucharist*, to be *the only begotten Son of God under the Accidents of Bread and Wine*. As for what he alledges out of *Vasquez*, that *supposing the presence of Christ to be the Ground of Adoration*, it follows in his Opinion, *that God may very lawfully be adored by us in any created Beeing, wherein he is intimately present*; I have spoken to it in the 5*th*. Chapt. of the 1. Part: And as *Vasquez* himself acknowledges the *danger* of that *Doctrine* if it should be *commonly* and *publickly* put in *practise* by the People; (for possibly there may be another consideration for *Philosophical* and *Contemplative* Men in their *private Devotions*, as St. *Leo* there cited seems to grant) so if the Doctrine be Good, what follows from thence is that *Christ*, being supposed to be *really present*

in

in the *Sacrament*, and in a particular manner by *Tranſubſtantiation*, may moſt certainly be *adored* in it. *Vaſquez* was a Man of great learning, and of a *ſearching wit*, but it is noted of him, as of *Lactantius*, that he was more *ſubtil* in *oppugning* the Opinions of *others*, than *ſolid* in *eſtabliſhing* his *own*.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Dr. St.'s Fundamental Principle of judging of matters proposed to our Belief by Sense and Reason, shown to be absurd in it self, and destructive to Christianity.

§. 1. WE come now to the Doctor's *Second* Proposition, p. 130 that *there are not the same Motives and Grounds to believe the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, that there are to believe that Christ is God: which*, he saith, *I affirm without any appearance of reason. And he would gladly know what excellent Motives and Reasons these are, which so advantageously recommend so absurd a doctrine as Transubstantiation is, as to make any Man think he hath reason to believe it. He is sure*, he saith, *it gives the greatest advantage to the Enemies of Christ's Divinity, to see these two put together upon equal terms, as though no Man could have reason to believe Christ to be the Eternal Son of God, that did not at the same time swallow the greatest Contradictions to sense and reason imaginable.* This is a *Topick*, in which the Doctor wonderfully delights himself (as all others have done before him who have deserted

serted the *Faith* of the *Church*.) We have it over and over at every turn; as if the whole *System* of *Christian Faith*, and every particular *Article* of it, were to be measured by the *Standard* of *Sense* and *Reason*; so that if any thing seem *absurd* and *contradictory* to *them*, no *grounds* or *motives* can recommend it *so advantageously, as to make any Man think he hath reason to believe it.* This is what lies at the bottom of his Discourse; and himself lays it down for the *only Principle* or *Criterium* by which we are to judge of the *Truth* of *Divine Revelation*, when in his second *Classe* of *Principles*, he affirms, *There can be no other means imagined, whereby we are to judge of the Truth of divine Revelation,* p. 561. n. 5.

but a Faculty in us of discerning truth and falshood in matters propos'd to our Belief: which if we do not exercise in judging the truth of divine Revelation, we must be imposed upon by every thing which pretends to be so. The perfect discussion of this *Principle*, I shall not engage my self in at present. *These Men of Principles*, (as the Doctor calls them not without just cause) are likely enough to take it into *Consideration* a *second*, and perhaps a *third* time too. At present it may suffice to shew briefly how *absurd in it self*, and how *destructive to Christian Religion* this *Principle* of the *Doctor's* is, Viz. *That*

we are to judge of the truth of divine Revelation, (*i. e.* whether *God* have *revealed* ſuch a thing, or *no*) *by exerciſing our Faculty of diſcerning truth and falſhood in matters propoſed to our belief:* that is, by making our *Reaſon* the *Judge*, whether the matter propoſed to our belief be *true* or *falſe*. This is what I *can* underſtand by the Doctor's *words* to be his *meaning*. If *He* can give *them* a better, I ſhall be glad to find my ſelf *miſtaken*. But if this be, (as to me it ſeems to be) the ſenſe of his words, I am ſorry that any thing ſo *irrational* in its ſelf, and ſo fatal to *Religion*, ſhould proceed from the Pen of a *Chriſtian*. For firſt, as I ſaid, it is *abſurd in it ſelf*, becauſe it can by no means ſubſiſt, unleſs we will *equal Man's* knowledge with that of *God*. For, if *Man* cannot *comprehend* the *depth* of the *knowledge* and *power* of *God*, (that is, if *God* both *know* and *can do*, more than *Man* can *underſtand*) it is evident, that the *judgment* of *ſenſe* and *reaſon* about the *Truth* of the *matter propoſed*, can never be a fit means to aſſure him whether *God* have *revealed* it, or *no*; and it is as evident on the contrary, that if it be *ſufficiently* propoſed and aſſerted as *revealed* by *God*, though it ſeem never ſo *abſurd* and *contradictory* to humane *ſenſe* and *reaſon*, we muſt ſubmit our judgment to the *belief* of it, as True. 'Tis not all our reaſonings and *ſyllogiſms* againſt

the

the *matter proposed*, that can excuse us from the Obligation of *captivating our Understanding to the Obedience of Christ*. 2 Cor. 10. 5. That which seems a *Camel* to us, is not so much as a *Gnat* to the knowledge and power of *God*, and therefore rather than give *Him* the *lye*, we must strain our selves to *swallow what seems to be the greatest Contradiction to Sense and Reason Imaginable*. Our first Mother *Eve*, by taking part with her *sense* against *Faith*, destroyed her Self and Posterity by believing the *Devil* rather than *God*; and what more suitable *Penance* for this *Fault*, or *Cure* for this *Pride*, than for *God* to exact of us, that we should believe *Him* rather than our *sense*? and this particularly in the point of *Transubstantiation* of the *Bread* into the *Body* of our *Redeemer*; that as by following *sense*, and eating the fruit of the *Tree* of the *knowledge* of *Good* and *Evil*, Death came upon all, both of Soul and Body; so all may receive Life by denying the suggestions of Sense, and eating the true food of the *Body* of *Christ*, under the forme of *Bread*. 2*dly*, It is *destructive* to *Christianity*, since if we must believe nothing, but what our *Sense* and *Reason* can *comprehend*, we must lay aside our *Creed*, and neither believe the *Creation* of the World, nor the *Trinity* of *Persons*, nor the *Incarnation* of the *Son* of *God*, nor the *Resurrection* of the *Dead*: all which seem

to imply as many and great *Absurdities* and *Contradictions*, as the Doctor, for his heart, can Object against *Transubstantiation*. It would be too tedious to insist upon them all: Those who are curious may meet with them every where in the Writings both of those who *impugn*, and of those who *defend* the *Catholick* belief in those *Points*. Yet to give the Reader a clearer Insight into the *absurdness* and malignity of this Principle of the Doctors, and how *agreeable* this *proceeding* of his is in this Point to that of other *Dissertors* of the *Church's Faith*: I shall instance in some of the *Contradictions* objected against the *Mysteries* of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*; and that in the words of Dr. *Beaumont* (now *Master* of *Peter-House* in *Cambridge*) in his most excellent *Poem* call'd *Psyche*, or *Love's Mystery*. *Verses* I know, in a *Book* of *Controversy* will seem as improper, and come as unexpected, as a *Garden* of *Flowers* in a *rough* and *craggy Desert*: but a *Traveller* will not find fault with his *Guide* for leading him thorough *it*, if he lead him not *out* of his *way*. My Adversary, without any occasion given him, to please the *Atheistical* humour of the Wits of the Time, could think fit to turn Spiritual *Archy*, and make sport with the *Saints* in so prophane a manner, as is no where to be parallel'd in the *worst* of *Play-Books*. And I hope after so many

many *hard* and *ſpiny* Queſtions of the *Schools* wherewith he hath perplex'd the minds of his *ſober* Readers, I may have leave to *divert* them with citing a little *Poetry*, which doth but expreſs in *Verſe*, what the *matter* it ſelf *leads* me to have ſaid in *Proſe*: See then how the aforeſaid Dr. *Beaumont* introduces a *Cerinthian Heretick* endeavouring to ſeduce *Pſyche* (that is, the *Soul*) from the belief of the *Myſteries* of the *Incarnation* and *Trinity* upon Dr. *St.*'s Principles of *Senſe* and *Reaſon*.

Canto 15.

[213]

Blind Ignorance was grown ſo bold, † that *ſhe*
Sought to perſwade the World it had *no eyes*.
Making the *lazy Name of Myſtery*
Inſtead of *Demonſtration* ſuffice.
From this black Pit thoſe monſtrous *Prodigies** *
Of *Hood-wink'd* and *abuſed Faith* did riſe.

† Before *Cerinthus* came.

* So *Cerinthus* calls the Myſteries of the Trinity and Incarnation

[214]

Who can imagin *Heaven* would e're ob'trude
Upon the *Faith of Reaſonable Men*,
That which *againſt all Reaſon* doth conclude,
And founded is on *Contradiction*?
Sure God ſo ſtrange a Law did never give,
That Men muſt not be Men if they believe.

[219]

†Catholicks For though the *Marvel-Mongers* † grant that He
Was moulded up but of a *Mortal Mettal*,
And that his *substance* was the same, which we
Find in our selves to be so *weak* and *brittle*;
Yet an *Eternal God* they make Him too,
And angry are, that *we will not do so*.

[220]

Thus the *quaint madness of a dreaming Brain*
Holds the same thing a *Mountain* and a *Mite*,
Fancies the *Sun*, (*Light's Royal Soveraign*)
To look like *swarthy* and *ignoble Night*:
Imagins wretched *Worms*, although it see
They crawl in Dirt, *Illustrious Kings* to be.

[221]

But *Heaven* forbid, that we should so *blaspheme*
And think our *God*, *as poor a thing as we*.
How can *Eternity* be born in *Time*?
How can *Infinity* a *Baby* be?
Or how can Heaven and Earth's Almighty *Lord*
To *Ægypt* fly for fear of *Herod's* Sword?

[226]

I know they strive to mince the matter by
Distinguishing his *Natures*. For their *Art*
Being asham'd of no *Absurdity*
Himself from his own self presumes to part.
Yet we durst not admit a *Deity*,
Which must on a *distinction* builded be.

But

[227]

But how much *more than Mad*, their doctrine is,
And how transcending *Pagan Blasphemy*,
Who not content to make *a God* of This
Both *Passible* and *Mortal Jesus*, try
To thrust Him into one *substantial knot*
With his *Eternal sire*, who Him begot?

[228]

Two yet *not Two*, but *One* these *Two* must be,
Nay and a *Third* into the *knot* they bring,
The *Spirit* must come in to make up *Three*,
And yet these *Three* be but *one single Thing*.
Thus *fast and loose* they play, or *ev'n and odd*,
And We a *juggling Trick* must have for *God*.

[229]

If *God* be *One*, then let Him be so still,
Why jumble we, we know not what together?
Did all the *World* not know their *God* untill
This *old blind Age* discover'd Him? Did neither
The *Patriarks* believe, nor *Prophets* see
Aright, because They *took not One for Three*?

[231]

Let *Love* and *Duty* make of *Christ* as high
And Glorious a Thing, as Wit can reach,
Provided that against the Deity
No *Injury* nor *Sacriledge* they preach;
If only on such terms He lov'd may be,
Him to *neglect* is *Piety*, say we.

And then a little after he concludes.

[234]

For If your *Faith* relies on *Men*, who are
Themſelves but founded and built up of *duſt*;
If you by *Reaſon's Rule* diſdain to ſquare
Your Piety, and *take your God on Truſt*,
(Which *Heaven* forbid) You only are a Prize
Unto *Impoſtor's* fair-tongu'd *Fallacies*.

Thus doth this *Ingenious* Perſon repreſent an *Heretick* in his *true Colours*, arguing againſt the *Myſteries* of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*, upon the Principles with which Doctor *St.* impugns the *Doctrin* of *Tranſubſtantiation*, and in terms ſo equivalent, that the *Dr.* ſeems but to have reſolv'd into *Proſe* what the *other* wrote in *Verſe*, as may appear from this following Parallel. 'Tis *Ignorance* and *Madneſs*, ſaith the *Cerinthian Heretick*, to believe that *God* can be *Three* and *One*, and that *Chriſt* is *God*. *Stanz.* 213. 220. 'Tis *Folly* and *Madneſs* ſaith Dr. *St.* to believe *Tranſubſtantiation*, (*He becomes an Idolater by not being a Fool or a Mad-man.*) p. 120. The *Myſteries* of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation are monſtrous Prodigies of abuſed Faith*, ſaith the *Cerinthian*, *Stanz.* 213. *Tranſubſtantiation*, ſaith Dr. *St. is ſo ſtrange and ſudden a change, that he can hardly ſay, that God becoming Man was ſo great a wonder, as*

a

a little piece of bread becoming God, p. 120. The *Cerinthian* affirms of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*, that they are *against all reason*, and *founded on Contradictions*, Stanz. 214. Dr. *St.* affirms of *Transubstantiation*, that it is *absurd*, and for a Man to believe it, *he must swallow the greatest Contradictions to Sense and Reason Imaginable*, p. 130. In a word the *Cerinthian* makes his *Sense* and *Reason* to be the *Rule* of his *Faith*, Stanz. 234. And Dr. *St.* will *believe* nothing that seems to *contradict them*, p. 561. Only the *Cerinthian* affirms the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation* to transcend *Pagan-blasphemy*, which I do not see yet that Dr. *St.* hath ventured to say of the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. Perhaps he will reply to this Parallel, that the difficulties the *Cerinthian* objects against the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*, are but *seeming Contradictions*; but *those* in the Point of *Transubstantiation* are *real* ones: but then he must grant according to his Principles, that whilst they *seem* to be *Contradictions*, they are not to be *believed* by *those* to whom they *seem* so, that is, by the *unlearned*, who are the greatest part. Or if they may notwithstanding *believe* those *Mysteries*, they may much rather believe that of *Transubstantiation*, since it *seems* a *greater* Contradiction, that the very self *same Nature* should be *whole* and *undivided* in *three* distinct *Persons*, than

that

that the *same Body* should be in *many places*, and that the *Invisible Word should be made Flesh*, than that *Bread* should be *converted* into that *Flesh*. How Dr. *St.* will extricate himself I know not; but the way which Dr. *Beaumont* takes to secure the *Soul* from being startled with these *seeming* Contradictions, is to introduce her *Angel Guardian*, conducting her to *Christ's Catholick Church*, the *Ground* and *Pillar* of *Truth*. And upon this Ground it is, (For in his *Preface*, he recants aforehand, if *any thing* throughout the whole *Poem* should happen *against his Intention*, to prove *discord* to the *Consent* of *Christ's Catholick Church*) that he makes the *Angel* perswade his *Pupil* to contemn all the *seeming Contradictions*, which crafty and subtil Wits object against the *Real Presence* of *Christ's* Body in the *Sacrament*, if not against *Transubstantiation* it self. And because the Book is not every where to be found (as not having been so often Printed as Dr. *St.'s*, because there is no *Prophane Invective* in it against the *Persons* and *Lives* of *Gods Saints*)

Canto. 16.

I shall venture to Transcribe another parcel of *Verses* out of it, so proper to the present *subject*, as if written on purpose by the Ingenious Author, to crush in the Egg those secret *workings* of *Atheism* and *Irreligion*,

Canto. 12.

which

which the aforesaid Principle is apt to breed in the *Wits* of this Age, under so colourable a pretence, as that of not being *fool'd* out of their *Sense* and *Reason*.

[74]

When *Jesus* by his *Water* cleansed had
His Servant's *Feet*, and by his *Grace* their *Hearts*
Shewing what Preparation must be made
By all who ever mean to have their Parts.
In his *pure Banquet* down he sits again
And them with *Miracles* doth entertain.

And then having described the *Institution* of the *Sacrament*, he goes on.

[81]

Sweet *Jesu*! O how can thy World forget
Their *Royal Saviour*, and his Bounty, who
Upon their Tables *his own self* hath set;
Who in their *Holy Cups* fails not to flow,
And in their *Dishes* lie. Did ever Friend
So *sure a Token* of his Love commend?

[82]

Infallibly there dost *Thou* flow and lie;
Though mortal Eyes discover no such thing:
Quick-sighted *Faith* reads all the Mystery,
And *humble Pious Souls* doth easily bring
Into the *Wonder's Cabinet*; and there
Makes all *the Jewels of this Truth appear*.

Thee

[83]

Shee generouſly dares *on God rely*
And *truſt his Word*, how *ſtrange* ſo e're it be:
If *Jeſus* once pronounces, *This is my*
Body and Blood; Far, far, be it, cries ſhe,
That I ſhould think my *dying Lord would cheat*
Me in his *Legacy of Drink and Meat.*

[84]

(His *Word* is moſt *Omnipotent*, and He
Can do what e're he ſays; and more than I
Can or would underſtand. What is't to me
If He tranſcends Humane Capacity?
Surely it well becomes Him ſo to do,
Nor were He *God*, if he could not do ſo;

[85]

Let Him ſay what He will I muſt deny
Him to be *God*, or elſe believe His *Word*;
Me it concerneth not to verify
What he proclaims; I only muſt afford
Meek Credit, and let Him alone to make
Good, whatſoever He is pleas'd to ſpeak)

[85]

Groſs and unworthy Spirits ſure They be,
Who of their *Lord* ſuch mean Conceptions frame,
That parting from his deareſt Conſorts, He
No Tokens of his Love did leave with Them,
But *ſimple Bread and Wine*; a likely Thing,
And well-becoming *Heavens Magnificent King.*

Ask

[88]

Ask me not then, How can the Thing be done,
What power of *Senſe* or *Reaſon* can digeſt it?
Fools as you are, what *Demonſtration*
So evident as this, *My God profeſt it?*
And if you once can prove, that *He* can lie,
This *Wonder*, and *Him* too, I will deny.

[89]

What thank is it, that you can credit that
Which your own *ſenſe & Reaſon's* eye reads plain?
Heaven's much to them beholden, who will not
Believe it *higher* is, than they can ſtrain;
Who jealous are of God, and will not be
Induc'd to *truſt Him further than they ſee.*

[90]

And yet had you theſe modeſt eyes of mine,
You in this g'oomy *Cloud* would ſee the *Sun*;
That *Sun* who wiſe'y doth diſdain to ſhine
On thoſe, who with bold prying preſs upon
His *ſecret Majeſty*, which plainly I
Becauſe I make no anxious ſearch, deſcry.

The words of the Angel to the Soul.

[91]

This is the *valorous Reſolution*
Of Gallant *Faith:* and this will ſerve to be
The *Bleſſed Rule*, by which all thoſe muſt run,
Who are *the Scholars of Humility.*
Yet I muſt tell thee *Pſyche*, *itching Pride*
Will not hereafter thus be ſatisfi'd:

And

And then having inveigh'd in the following *Stanza's*, againſt thoſe, who will needs be prying with the *skill, they take for granted hath fill'd their brains*; (that is with the Doctor's *faculty of diſcerning Truth and falſhood*) into the *manner how this Miracle* is brought to paſs, He concludes with theſe words in favour of *Tranſubſtantiation*.

[99]

It is in vain to tell theſe *Wranglers* how
Jeſus could graft cold *Stones* into the ſtock
Of *Abraham*, and make them fertil grow
In *Iſraelites*; or that the *Bread* he took
In's daily Diet, was not wholly ſpent,
But part into his *Body's ſubſtance* went.

[100]

In vain to tell them, how into his *Blood*
The *Wine* he drank was *changed* day by day.
For though ſuch ſpeculations underſtood
With prudent Reverence might make eaſier way
Unto the *Myſtery*; yet *Wranglers* will
Becauſe they will be ſo, be *Wranglers* ſtill.

This and much more to this Purpoſe, (which not to ſurfet the Reader with too many delicacies I omit) ſaith the *Author* of that *Illuſtrious Poem*; in which to the ſatisfaction of all that read it, himſelf hath made appear to the World, what his *Modeſty* made him willing to expect rather from others

others, that *a Divine Theam is as capable and happy a ſubject of Portical Ornament, as any Pagan or Humane device whatſoever.* And would the *Gallants* of both Sexes employ as many of their precious Hours in reading this *excellent Piece*, as they do in *Romances* and *Play-Books*, I dare be bold to affirm, (though perhaps I ſhall not be credited) They would find not only more *ſubſtance*, but more *delight* in *this* than in the *beſt* of *them*. But to return to my preſent buſineſs. My deſign was to let the Reader ſee, how far my Adverſary's beloved *Principles* of *Senſe* and *Reaſon*, are from being fit Umpires, to *judge* of *matters propoſed as of divine Revelation*; particularly in what relates to the *preſence* of our Saviour in the *Euchariſt*, and I thought I could not do it better, than in the words of this *learned* and *Ingenious Author*, whoſe whole Diſcourſe ſeems but a Deſcant upon thoſe words of St. *Chryſoſtom*, when ſpeaking of this *Myſtery* to the People of *Antioch*, he ſaith, *Let us obey God in all things, and not gain-ſay Him, though what is ſaid, ſeem to contradict both our Imaginations and Eyes. Let his word obtain more credit from us than our thoughts or ſight. And thus let us behave our ſelves in the Myſteries* (that is in the moſt Holy Sacrament) *not beholding only thoſe things which lye before us,* (*Hom.* 60. *ad pop.*

(*viz.*

(*viz.* the Symbols of Bread and Wine) *but holding fast his words. For his Word is Infallible, but our ſenſe is eaſy to be deceived. That never fails, but this moſt frequently miſtakes. Becauſe therfore the Word ſaith. This is my Body, let us obey and believe and behold Him with the eyes of our Underſtanding.* If the Doctor will not do ſo, but will have his Readers to meaſure *matters* of *Faith* by the *Rule* of *Senſe* and *Reaſon*, and not truſt *God* farther than they can *ſee* with *them*, I am ſure he gives a far *greater advantage* to the Enemies of the moſt *Holy Trinity* and *Chriſt's Divinity* by ſo *unChriſtian a Principle*, than we can poſſibly do by aſſerting a *like divine Revelation* for his being *preſent* in the *Euchariſt*, as for his being *true God*, notwithſtanding the *ſeeming contradictions* that occur in it.

But perhaps the Doctor will ſay, that I am miſtaken all this while, and that he meant *no* ſuch *thing* by the *uſe of Reaſon:* For I remember now, that when upon his Aſſerting, *that Catholicks expoſe the Faith of Chriſtians to a great uncertainty, by denying to Men the uſe of their Judgment and Reaſon, as to the matters of Faith propoſed by a Church when they muſt uſe it in the choice of a Church*: (which if it ſay any thing to the purpoſe, it muſt be this, that becauſe *Men* muſt make uſe of their *reaſon*

In his 3*d*. Anſw. to the 1. Queſt. p. 7.

reaſon to find out the *true Ground* of believing (which *Catholicks* affirm to be the *Church*) therefore they muſt *believe* nothing which the *Church* propoſes as a *matter* of *Faith*, but what the *Faculty in them* (called reaſon) *of diſcerning Truth and Falſhood in matters propoſed to our belief*, ſhall judge to be *true* in it ſelf; for otherwiſe how doth it follow that they expoſe the Faith of Chriſtians to uncertainty?) when I ſay upon this aſſertion of his, *I ſuppoſed* (and clearly enough I think) that *the uſe he would have of reaſon, was to believe nothing, but what his reaſon could underſtand*, He aſſures me (p. 542.) upon his word *that he meant no ſuch thing, for I believe*, ſaith he, *an Infinite Being, and all the Doctrines revealed by it in H. Scriptures, although I cannot reconcile all particulars concerning them to thoſe Conceptions we call Reaſon.* But here I obſerve firſt, (as no very great *ſign* that he means not by the *uſe* of *Reaſon*, what I ſuppoſed) that he doth not tell us of any *one* particular *Article* he believes with that terrible condition, unleſs he mean he *cannot reconcile all particulars concerning the exiſtence of a Deity*; but huddles them up in a blind *Univerſal, that he believes all the Doctrines revealed by God in the H. Scriptures*; as if it were enough for a *Chriſtian* to believe in *general all* that *God* hath revealed in *Scripture*, without troubling himſelf about the

Senſe of any thing in *particular*, for fear of over-ſtraining his *Reaſon* to ſwallow ſomething that may ſeem a Contradiction. And I confeſs the *Letter* of the *Scripture* may be a ſufficient *Rule* of *ſuch* a *Faith*. 2dly, *This Aſſertion* of his *expoſes the Faith of Chriſtians* to as great *uncertainty* as *that* he charges upon *Catholicks*; by its *denying* to Men the *uſe* of their *Judgment* and *Reaſon as to matters of Faith revealed by God in the Scriptures*, when they muſt neceſſarily *uſe* them to find out the *Scriptures*, and the *exiſtence of a Deity*. For whether the *Scripture* or the *Church* be ſuppoſed to be the *Ground* of believing, the caſe is the ſame as to the Point of *Reaſon*. Men muſt be allowed the *uſe* of their *Judgment* and *Reaſon* in the ſearch of both. And therefore he muſt either acknowledge his *Charge* to have been *groundleſs* when he taxed *Catholicks* for *expoſing Faith to uncertainty*; or he muſt grant to Men, (though it be with contradicting himſelf, which is much eaſier to do, than to ſwallow the leaſt *ſeeming Contradiction* in a matter of Faith) that they may and ought to make *uſe* of *their diſcerning Faculty*, *as to the truth or falſhood of matters propoſed to our belief*, which I confeſs I take to be the ſame, as *to believe no more than their Reaſon can comprehend*: and ſo if *Reaſon* chance to meet with ſome *ſeeming Contradiction*, with which it is not *able*

or

or *willing* to grapple, the *Article* ought and must be exploded for such *a monstrous Prodigy of hood-wink'd and abused Faith, as no Man can imagine God would ere obtrude upon the Faith of Reasonable Men.*

But here again perhaps he will say, that although *God* may impose upon us an *Obligation* of *believing* against the *Conceptions* of our *Reason*, yet he *cannot* do it against the *suggestion* of our *sense*, because, as he asserts, p. 540. *This would be to overthrow all certainty of Faith, where the matters to be believed depend upon matter of Fact.* But here I would desire to know what *Angel* from Heaven reveal'd this Doctrin to him. Suppose in the case of the *two Disciples* at *Emmaus*, that our *Saviour* had vanished out of their sight, before he brake bread, might he not have told them afterwards that it was *He* who had appeared to them in a *disguise*, without overthrowing all the *certainty* of *Faith*, where *matters* to be believed *depend* upon *matter* of *Fact*? St. *Chrysostome* above cited I am sure was of another mind in the very point of *Christ's real presence* in the *Sacrament*, when he bids us *obey God in that mystery, though what he say seem to contradict our thoughts and eyes.* And so was St. *Cyril* too, when he exhorts *Christians not to consider it as naked Bread and Wine, for it is*, saith he, *the Body and* Orat. 4. Catech.

Blood of Christ according to the words of Christ himself. And although sense do suggest this to thee, (*viz.* that it is Bread) *yet let Faith confirm thee. Do not judge of the thing by thy taste, but know, and hold for most certain, that this Bread which is seen of us, is not Bread, though the taste judge it to be Bread, but the Body of Christ, and that the Wine which is seen by us, although it seem Wine to the sense of tasting, notwithstanding is not Wine, but the Blood of Christ.* This is what these *Holy Fathers* teach in this matter; and with great reason; for as *God* is not only *God* of the *Hills*, but also of the *Valleys*; So is he *God* not only of our *Reason*, but of our *Senses* also. And if the *Antidote* his *Goodness* hath prescrib'd to *Cure* our *Corrupt Nature*, be prepared in such a manner as requires the *captivating* of our *Sense* as well as of our *Understanding*, who shall question either his *Wisdome* or *Power?* He hath said, *This is my Body*, though it appear to us to be *bread*. And this being but *one Exception* from the *General Rule* of *Sensation*; why that should overthrow *all certainty* of *Faith*, more than *so many exceptions*, as the *Trinity* and other *Mysteries* lay upon the *General Rules* of our *Reasoning*, I leave to all Men of *sense* and *Reason* to judge. O but this is the strangest of *Miracles*, and *Miracles* ought to be the objects of *sense*, I grant it of

3 Kings 20.

such

such Miracles, as are done for the *Conversion* of *Unbelievers*; but *this* is not done upon such an account, but for the *Sanctification* of *those* who *believe* already. And for *these* it is enough that *Christ* hath said, *It is his Body*. They know very well the danger of *not believing him* more than their *senses*. And that *others* may know it also, I shall set it before them in the words of St. *Epiphanius*, no less than 1300. Years ago. *We see* (saith he speaking of the Blessed *Sacrament*) that *It is neither equal, nor like in proportion or Image to his Flesh, to the Invisible Deity, to the lineaments of a Body, for this is of a round forme, and insensible according to power. And yet because he was pleased to say through Grace, This is my* Body, *every one believeth his saying. For, who believeth not that it is his very true Body, falleth from Grace and Salvation.* Thus much to the Doctors Principles of *Sense* and *Reason*. Let us now see what he says against the *Grounds* and *Motives* of *Transubstantiation*.

In Ancor. Circ. Med.

CHAP. V.

A Check to the Doctor's bigg words againſt the Grounds of Tranſubſtantiation; with a new Example of reporting faithfully (as he calls it) the Words and Senſe of an Author.

§. 1. TO ſhow there are not the *ſame Grounds* and *Motives* for *Chriſts* preſence in the *Euchariſt* by *Tranſubſtantiation*, as for his *Divinity*, my Adverſary inſtances in Three. 1. *The Authority of the Roman Church.* 2. *Catholick Tradition.* 3. *Scripture.* And for the *firſt* of theſe, Viz. *The Authority of the Roman Church*, if it have *any at all*, it ſtands againſt the Doctor for *Tranſubſtantiation*, and that ſo evidently, that he is forced to take the confidence (p. 130.) *utterly to deny that to be any ground of believing at all.* For my part I believe every ſober Perſon of his own Party will judge he had much better have ſaid nothing at all. And I cannot but think how St. *Auſtin*, who calls *the Chair of Peter that Rock, which the proud Gates of Hell do not overcome:* and profeſſes that *the Principality of the Apoſtolick*

In Pſ. cont. Part. Donat. Ep. 162.

lick Chair did always conſerve its vigour in the Roman Church, would have ſtartled to hear one ſingle Doctor ſo pertly deny it to be *any Ground at all of believing*. How St. *Hierome*, who writing to Pope *Damaſus*, ſaith, *I know that upon this Rock the Church is built; and whoſoever eateth the Lamb out of this Houſe is Prophane*, &c. would have *whetted* his ſtile more againſt *him* for denying her *Authority* to be any *Ground* of believing *at all*, than ever he did againſt *Vigilantius*, for deriding *Invocation of Saints*, *Veneration of Relicks*, or *Lighting Candles at Noon-Day in the Church*, &c. And how St. *Irenæus* would have excluded him out of the Society of *Chriſtians*, for this *peremptory* behaviour, when he affirms it *neceſſary for all other Churches* (convenire) *to have recourſe, and agree with the Roman by reaſon of its more eminent Principality*. That this was the *Dignity* and *Prerogative* of the *Roman Church* in the time of theſe *Holy Fathers*, the Doctor himſelf cannot deny; and if he pretend ſhe is fallen from the *Purity* ſhe then enjoyed, it is but what the *Donatiſts* his *Predeceſſors* in this point, ſaid above twelve hundred years ago, when (as St. *Auſtin* tells us) they call'd the *Apoſtolick Chair, the Chair of Pe-*

Ep. ad Damaſ.

Li. 3. c. 3.

Li. 1. cont. lit. Petilian. c. 51.

ſtilence, becauſe it oppos'd their *Novelties*, as it does *his* at preſent. And although the *Challenge* have been often made, yet none of her Adverſaries have ever been able to ſhow the time when ſhe fell from her *Primitive Purity*, either into *Schiſm*, or *Hereſy*. Not yet before what *Tribunal* her cauſe was *examined*, or by what *Judge* ſhe hath been *condemned*, unleſs by *themſelves*, who are her *Accuſers*; whereas not only *Piety*, but even *Natural Reaſon* teaches, that *no particular Man* is to be condemned, much leſs deprived of what he ſtands *poſſeſſed*, till his cauſe be *Juridically heard* and *ſentenced*. Nor ought any Man to be *Judge* in his *own* cauſe, much leſs to *execute* the ſentence given by *himſelf*: All which the *New-Reformers* in *England*, *France*, *Germany*, &c. have done in denying the *Authority of the Roman Church*, and ſetting up for themſelves.

§. 2. But now inſtead of making Good his Aſſertion, Viz. *That the Authority of the Roman Church is no ground of believing at all, he deſires*, he ſaith, *with all his heart to ſee this Authority proved:* which is juſt what all other *Accuſers* do when their Proofs fail, to call upon the *Defendant* to prove his *Title*, which after a long Poſſeſſion ought in all *Law* to ſtand *Good* and *Valid*, till the *Accuſer* can prove it to be *otherwiſe*. *Cromwell* might with much more reaſon have ſum-

mon'd

mon'd the *King* to prove his *Title* to the *Crown* after a Preſcription of 500. *Years*, than the Doctor can exact it from the *Church* to prove her *Authority*, of which ſhe hath been in Poſſeſſion a far longer time. *Olim poſſideo*, *Prior poſſideo* was the *Church*'s Plea in *Tertullian*'s time. 'Tis their part then to prove, who are the *Accuſers*; yet *Catholick Authors* to ſatisfy, if poſſible, the importunity of the *Church's Adverſaries*, have receded from the *Rigour* of this *Plea*, and written large Volumes in Juſtification of her Authority; Particularly the two learned Cardinals, *Bellarmin* and *Perron*: And now very lately Mr. *E. W.* (The Book is called *Religion* and *Reaſon*, and being written particularly againſt the Doctor, expects his Anſwer.) Theſe he may conſult at his leaſure; I ſhall only at preſent remind him of what I have proved already at his *requeſt* in the *firſt Chapter* of the *firſt Part*, (to which I refer the Reader,) Viz. *That a Chriſtian by vertue of his being ſo, is bound to be of the Communion of the Roman Church*: And then ſubſume; *But every Chriſtian is bound to ſubmit to the terms of Communion of that Church, whoſe Communion by being a Chriſtian he is bound to be of.* Therefore *every Chriſtian by vertue of his being ſo, is bound to ſubmit to the terms of Communion required by the Roman Church*: And this the Doctor knows

(for

(for he often complains of it as a great *violence* put upon his *Senſe* and *Reaſon*) to be a *ſubmiſſion to her Decrees in matters of Faith*; and particularly in the Point of *Chriſt's preſence* in the *Euchariſt* by *Tranſubſtantiation*, as well as of his being the ſame *True* and *Conſubſtantial God* with *his Father*.

§. 2. The *Second Ground* or *Motive* he Inſtances in, (and I ſuppoſe he will deny *this* too *to be any ground of believing at all*) is *Catholick Tradition*. This done, he bids me again, *to prove if I can* (as if it belong'd not at all to *him* who is the *Accuſer* to prove his *Action*; or as if it had been ſome *new point* which no *Catholick Author* had ever yet attempted to *prove*) *that Tranſubſtantiation was a Doctrine received in the Univerſal Church from our Saviour's time: and here*, he ſaith, *when I pleaſe he ſhall joyn iſſue with me. And if I think fit to put the Negative upon him, he will undertake to inſtance in an Age, ſince the firſt Three Centuries, wherein if the moſt learned Fathers and Biſhops (yea of Rome it ſelf) be to be credited, Tranſubſtantiation was not believed.* Theſe are *bigg words* indeed, and the Doctor might have done well to have remembred what the *King of Iſrael* anſwered to the proud meſſage of the *King of Syria*, *Let not him that girdeth*

3 Kings 20. 11.

girdeth on his Harneſs, boaſt himſelf as he that putteth it off. But it is no new *Artifice* in our Adverſaries, then to ſpeak *biggeſt*, when there is *leaſt cauſe* for it; as I ſhall make appear my Adverſary does in this matter from the very *Confeſſion* of *Proteſtants themſelves:* Which *kind* of *proof* is look'd upon by all ſober Men, as very *proper* both to ſatisfie the *Judgment* of an *Impartial Reader*, and alſo to abate the *boaſting* of *over confident* Spirits. For, as Biſhop *Hall* ſaith, *One blow of an Enemy dealt to his Brother, is worth more than many from an adverſe hand.* And upon this account it is, that when *Bellarmin* makes uſe of the like proof, (that is, undertakes to prove the *Roman* Church to be the *true* Church of *God*, by the Confeſſion of Proteſtants,) Dr. *Field* ſaith, *ſurely if he can prove, that we confeſs it to be the true Church, he needeth not to uſe any other arguments.* Let us ſee then what *Proteſtants* ſay in this Point. And firſt that *Tranſubſtantiation was a Doctrine received in the Univerſal* Church from the time of *Berengarius*, that is 600. Years ago, is ſcarcely denied by any that I know of. Mr. *Fox* himſelf acknowledgeth, that *about that time the denying of it began*

Peace of *Rome*, *Ep. dedic. fol.* 1.

Of the Church p. 182.

Act. Monum. Printed *Ann.* 1526. p. 1121.

gan to be accounted Heresy, and in that number, saith he, *was first one Berengarius, who lived about Anno* 1060. And Mr. *Perkins* allows it a longer Date, when he says that *during the space of* 900 *Years the Popish Heresy had spread it self over the whole World.* 2*dly*, That *it had remained in quiet possession from the Year* 850. (that is 200 Years before) *until the time of Berengarius* is confessed by *Joachim Camerarius*; as also *that although it had been called into Question before by the private Writings of some, yet the first that publickly impugned it was Berengarius.* 3*dly*, That *Damascene* in the beginning of the 8*th. Century*, and *Theophylact* (who though he be not so *ancient*, yet his Authority is much esteem'd by learned Men, because he is look'd on as an Abridger of St. *Chrysostome*) did plainly *incline to Transubstantiation*, is confess'd by *Ursinus*. (a) So is it of St. *Gregory* in the 6*th.* Age by Dr. *Humfrey*, (b) when he saith, that *he* and St. *Austin* the *Apostle* of *England*, *brought Transubstantiation into the English Church.* In the *fift* Age *Eusebius Emissenus* is taxed by the *Centurists*, to have spoken *not commodiously*

Expos. Symb. p. 266.

Hist. Narrat. p. 161.

(1) *Commonefact. p.* 211.

(a) *Jesuitism. p.* 2. *Rat.* 5. p. 626.

wisly (*viz.* for their purpose) *of Transubstantiation.*(c) The like is affirmed by them (d) of St. *Chrysostome* in the same Age, and of St. *Ambrose* (e) in the fourth; of S. *Cyprian* in the third by *Ursinus*, (f) of *Tertullian* and *Origen* in the second by the forenamed Centurists, (g) and S. *Ignatius* in the *first* is acknowledged by sundry *Protestants* (h) to have said of certain *Hereticks* of his time, That *they do not admit Eucharists and Oblations, because they do not confess the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which Flesh suffred for our Sins*; an evident sign that all those who held the *Flesh* of *Christ* to be *true Flesh*, and not *Phantastical*, believed also the *Eucharist* to be that *very true Flesh*.

(c) *Cent.* 4 *c.* 10. *Col.* 985.
(d) *Cent.* 5 *col* 517
(e) *Cent.* 4. *c.* 4. *col.* 295.
(f) *Commonefact. p.* 211. *&* 218.
(g) *Cent.* 3. *col.* 58. 260.
(h) *Hamelman. de Trad. Apost. c.* 7 4 6. *Chemn. Exam. part.* 1. *p.* 94.

This is what *Protestants* themselves confess of the most eminent *Fathers* of *God's Church* in each Age from our *Saviours* time concerning the *Doctrin* of *Transubstantiation*, as I find them cited in *two* Treatises, the one called *The Protestants Apology for the Roman Church*; the other, *The Progeny of Catholicks and Protestants*; whose *Authors* I never heard were taxed of insincerity in their quotations:

tations: And if it be true, what Dr. *Field* ſaith of *Bellarmin*, that *if he could prove that Proteſtants confeſs the Roman to be the true Church, he needed not to uſe any other arguments*, I might ſuperſede any farther proof of this matter, and leave the Doctor to join *iſſue* with his *Fellow-Brethren*.

But the Reader perhaps may deſire to ſee the *Teſtimonies* themſelves of thoſe *Fathers*, which were ſo *pregnant* as to force ſuch learned Men of the *Proteſtant Party* to confeſs that *they taught the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation*. And in order to his ſatisfaction in this Point, I ſhall ſet down one Teſtimony of each *Father* in the ſame order as they ſtand cited above, and *but One* to avoid Prolixity.

TESTIMONIES OF THE FATHERS FOR TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

IN the beginning of the Eighth Century, St. *Jo. Damaſcen*, li. 4. de fid. c. 14. *The Bread and Wine and Water are by the Invocation*

tion and Coming of the Holy Ghoſt, changed ſupernaturally into the Body and Blood of Chriſt: And with him agrees *Theophylact, The Bread is transformed by the Myſtical Benediction, and the coming of the Holy Ghoſt, into the Fleſh of our Lord.* In cap. 6. Joan.

At the end of the Fifth and beginning of the Sixth Century, St. *Gregory. Our Creator well knowing our Infirmity, by that Power, with which he made all things of nothing, by the Sanctification of his Spirit, converts the Bread and Wine mixed with Water (their proper ſpecies* or figure *remaining) into his Fleſh and Blood.* *Paul. Diacon. in ejus vita.*

In the Fifth *Euſebius Emiſſenus*, and St. *John Chryſoſtome.* The former ſaith, *Before Conſecration, there is the Subſtance of Bread and Wine, but after the words of Chriſt, it is the Body and Blood of Chriſt. For what wonder that he who created them with his Word, ſhould convert or change them after they were created?* The latter, *The things we propoſe are not done by Humane Power: We hold but the place of Miniſters, but he that ſanctifieth and changeth them is Chriſt himſelf.* Serm. de corp. dom. Hom. 83. in Matth.

In the Fourth Century St. *Ambroſe*, and becauſe

because this is the Age I suppose the Doctor pitches upon, when he saith he will undertake to *instance in an Age, since the first three Centuries*, Wherein *if the most learned Fathers and Bishops who lived in it are to be credited, Transubstantiation was not believed*; I shall be somewhat larger in citing the words of St. *Ambrose*, and also add other Testimonies of *Fathers* of the same time to *his*, that the Reader may see what *Issue* his *Undertaking* is like to have in this matter.

First, Then St. *Ambrose*, *li. de Initiand. c. 9.* as if he foresaw my Adversaries objection, puts it down in these formal words. *You will say perhaps, How do you prove to me that I receive the Body of Christ, when I see another thing?* And the way he takes to *Answer* it, is by comparing the *change* made here in the Nature of the Bread, with the *examples* of *those miraculous changes*, which were wrought by Holy Men of Old in the *Natures* of other things, as of *Moses's Rod being turned into a Serpent*, the *Waters of Ægypt into Blood*, &c. From whence he infers, that *if the Benediction of those who were but pure Men, was of such force, as to change Nature, What must we say of that divine Consecration, where the very words of our Lord and Saviour do operate?*-- *Thou hast read*, saith he, *of the works of the Creation, how God spake the Word and they were*

were made, he commanded and they were created, (that is, produc'd out of nothing) *The Word therefore of Christ which of nothing could make that to be which was not, can it not change those things which are* (*viz.* Bread and Wine) *into that which before they were not,* (*viz.* his own Body and Blood?) *surely it is not a less matter to give new natures to things* out of nothing, *than to change them* after they are made.—— Again, *You will say perhaps, my Bread is usual* Bread, *No,* (saith he) *this Bread is Bread before the Sacramental words; When the Consecration is performed, of Bread is made the Flesh of Christ.*—— *He spake the Word and it was made; he commanded and it was created.*—And that we may not doubt he meant it was made his *true Flesh,* he saith, *As our Lord Jesus Christ is the true Son of God, not as Men are by Grace, but as the Son, of the substance of his Father; so it is his very true Flesh, as himself hath said, which we receive, and his very true Blood which we drink.* This and much more doth St. *Ambrose* write of this subject; so that no Man need to wonder, if the *Centurists* say, *he wrote not well of Transubstantiation:* And I have either read or heard it reported of *Calvin* that

li. 4. de Sacram: c. 4.

li. 6. c. 1.

Cent. 4. c. 4. col. 295.

he wish'd the *Devil* had struck the *Pen* out of St. *Ambrose*'s hand, when he wrote those *Books of the Sacraments*. But let us now see what other Fathers of the same Age teach concerning this Point. S. *Cyril*,

Orat. 4. C. *Our Saviour*, saith he, *sometime changed Water into Wine, and shall we not think him worthy of our belief, that he changed Wine into* his *Blood?* S. Gregory Nyssen.

Orat. magn. Catech. c. 37. *We do rightly believe that the Bread sanctified by the Word of God, is changed into the Body of God the Word. By vertue of his Benediction he changeth the nature of the things which are seen (Bread and Wine) into that, Viz.* his own Body.

Tract. 2. de Exod. S. *Gaudentius. The Maker & Lord of Natures, who produceth Bread out of the Earth, doth again of Bread, because he can, and hath promised to do it, make his own Body, and He who made Water of Wine, maketh of Wine his own Blood.* These are *Fathers* who lived in the *Age* immediately following the *three first Centuries*, to whom I might add St. *Chrysostome* above cited, (who flourished in this *Century*, though he dyed in the beginning of the *next*) and others; but these may suffice to let the Reader see, (if this be the Age which the Doctor intends to instance in) how

how unlikely it is he ſhould make good what he aſſerts, that *Tranſubſtantiation was not believed in it.*

In the Third Century St. *Cyprian* ſaith, *The Bread which our Lord gave to his Diſciples, being changed not in ſhape or figure, but in nature, was by the Omnipotency of the Word made Fleſh.* And *Urſinus* confeſſeth, *There are many ſayings in him which ſeem to affirm Tranſubſtantiation.* And *Tertullian* in the ſame Age, ſaith, that *our Lord having taken Bread made it his own Body, by ſaying, This is my Body:* and St. *Ignatius* in the *firſt*, confeſſeth *the Euchariſt to be the Fleſh of Chriſt which ſuffred for our ſins.* And now let the *Reader* judge whether thoſe learned *Proteſtants* above cited, had reaſon to affirm of theſe *Fathers* (though they taxed them of error for it) that for what appears by their words *they believed and taught the Doctrin of Tranſubſtantiation.* I know the Doctor will not want many a pretty *artifice* to obſcure, if poſſible, and elude the force of theſe *Teſtimonies*, but the *Confeſſion* of his *Brethren* will ſtill be a *Potent Prejudice* againſt him. Nor can he ever have the courage to deny, but

Serm. de cœna Dom.

Commonefact. *p.* 211. *&* 218.

li. 4. *in Marcion.*

Ep. ad Smyrn.

that the words taken as they ſound, *ſeem* evidently at leaſt to teach the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*; and yet (what is highly obſervable in this caſe) *this being a matter of ſo great conſequence*, that Dr. *Morton* confeſſeth, *if it be defenſible, Proteſtants muſt ſtand chargeable of Hereſie, but if it may be confuted, the Romaniſts muſt neceſſarily be condemned of Idolatry*: None of thoſe *Fathers*, who are cited by *Proteſtants* as *Abettors* of *Tranſubſtantiation*, were ever taxed of Errour for what they aſſerted by any of their *Contemporaries*, whom we know to have been very *jealous* not only of *new doctrines*, but of any *new forms* of *words*; or by *thoſe* who lived in the *Ages after* them: nor yet did the *Greeks* move any diſpute about this Point in the *Council* of *Florence*; whereas *Berengarius* no ſooner began to broach the *contrary*, but immediately the *whole Church*, as the Writers of that time witneſs, was ſtartled at the *Novelty*, and condemned it as *Hereſie*, as Mr. *Fox* above cited witneſſeth.

Prot. Appeal. li. 2. p. 105.

§. 4. But what if the Doctor ſhall deny all this, that is, both the *Teſtimonies* of the *Fathers*, and the *Confeſſion* of his *Brethren* to be *ſufficient* to prove *Tranſubſtantiation to have been a Doctrine received in the Univerſal Church from Chriſt's time?* To ſhow the unreaſon-

reasonableness of such a denyal, I would propose this case to *his* Consideration, and the *Readers*. *Viz.* In supposition that a *Controversy* arise in this present Age about the *sense* of a *Law*, which was made 500. Years ago, and that a considerable number of *those* who started the *Controversy*, should *confess*, that for the last two hundred years the *contrary* to what they maintain, was generally received in the Kingdom as the *sense* of the *Law*, and shou'd further *confess* that the most *eminent Lawyers* of the *former* Ages, from the first *enacting* of the *Law*, held the *same* with the *latter*; Nor had there ever been any disagreement or *opposition* among them in that Point; whether it be not a *sufficient* proof, that what they taught to be the *sense* of the *Law*, was generally received to be the *sense* and meaning of it, from the beginning? The *Testimonies* themselves of those *Ancient Lawyers* would be conviction enough: how much more when *strengthned* by the *Confession* of the *Adverse Party* it self? Now if this be *so* in the delivery of the *sense* of a *humane Law*, where it happens very often that great *Lawyers* may be and often are of *different judgements*; how much more, in the delivery of a *divine Doctrine*, where the *Pastors* of the *Church* are bound to *deliver* what they *received*, and the *succeeding Age* is stil *bound* to *receive* what they *delivered*?

Surely, if we add to this the *Confession* of the very *Adversaries* themselves, the *Proof* (as St. *Irenæus* saith) must be *true and without contradiction.*

Adv. hær. lib. 4. c. 14.

§. 5. But if the Doctor will still persist in the denyal of so Evident a Proof; because the *Proposition* is *comparative* between the *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation*, and *that* of *Christ's Divinity*, as to its *general reception* in the *Church*, I must desire him *soberly* to consider, how much less St. *Athanasius* thought *sufficient* to prove this *latter* to be a *Catholick Tradition*. For having cited the *Testimonies* of *four Fathers* only for the *Consubstantiality* of the *Son* with his *Father*, viz. *Theognostus*, *Dionysius Alexandrinus*, *Dionysius Romanus*, and *Origen*, he concludes with an *Ecce. Behold, we demonstrate*, saith he, *this Doctrine to have been delivered from Fathers to Fathers, as it were by hand.* And St. *Austin* using the like Argument in the point of *original sin*, first makes this Preface, *I will alledge*, saith he, *a few Testimonies of a few of the Fathers, with which nevertheless our Adversaries will be constrained to blush and yield, if either any fear*

De Decret. Nicen. Synodi.

Contr. Julian. li. 1. c. 2. &c.

fear of God, or ſhame of Men can over-power in them ſo pervicacious an obſtinacy. And then having produced the Teſtimonies of *five* or *ſix* of the *Latin Fathers*, he tells *Julian* againſt whom he wrote, that *that part of the World ought to ſuffice him*, (that is, to make him yield it to be the *Catholick Faith*) *in which our Lord was pleaſed to crown with a moſt glorious Martyrdome the Firſt* (or Prince) *of the Apoſtles.* And then to ſhow that the *Faith* of the *Greek Church* was the *ſame* with that of the *Latin* in this Point, he cites the Teſtimonies only of *three Greek Fathers*; and to the firſt of them, viz. St. *Greg. Nazianzen*, he immediately adds, *This is ſo great a Man, that neither he would ſay this but from the Chriſtian Faith moſt notorious to all; neither would they have eſteemed him ſo Venerable, if they had not acknowledged that he ſpake theſe things out of the rule of the moſt known Truth.* And now let the Reader judg whether when we produce a far *greater number* of moſt manifeſt *Teſtimonies* of the *Fathers* of ſeveral Ages, teaching without any Contradiction that *the Bread is changed into the Body of Chriſt by Conſecration*; and this confeſſed of *ſome* of the moſt Eminent of *them* in *every Age* by *Proteſtants* themſelves, we do not more than *ſufficiently* prove that it was *a Doctrine received in the Univerſal Church from our Saviour's time?* And, if he think

yet he can produce greater Evidence for the Doctrine of *Christ's Divinity*, being *univerſally* received in the *Church* from *Chriſt's* time, the *early conteſt* of the *Arrians* about that *Point*, their *Power*, and *Continuance* for ſo many Ages, compared with the *open* and *undiſturbed* delivery of the *Doctrin* of *Tranſubſtantiation*, may ſoon convince him of the *vanity* of *ſuch* an undertaking.

§. 6. The 3*d*. and laſt *Ground* he inſtances in, is *Scripture*; and *this*, he ſaith, *he doth and ſhall acknowledge for his only Rule of Faith in ſpight of all pretences to infallibility either in Church or Tradition*. When he hath conſidered well, what Mr. *E. W.* hath ſaid to him upon this Subject in his two Learned Treatiſes, (*Proteſtancy without Principles*, and *Religion and Reaſon*) I hope this *ſpight* of *his* may be abated. But in the mean time what doth he alledge out of this his *only Rule* of *Faith* (as he will have it) againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*? Not ſo much I can aſſure you as *one* ſingle *Text*. But becauſe *Bellarmin* produces *One*, and but *One* for that Point, (*viz*. the words of *Chriſt*, *This is my Body*.) whereas he cites *many* for proof of *Chriſt's Divinity*, he will appeal to him, *whether there are the ſame Grounds and Motives from thence to believe Tranſubſtantiation, as there are the Divinity of Chriſt*. But if *Catholicks* do not acknowledge *Scripture* alone to be the *Rule* of

of *Faith*, what am I concern'd whether *Bellarmin* produce *many* Texts, or but *One*, or *none* at all? Does not the Doctor himself say, that *some of our Religion have said, that Transubstantiation could not be prov'd from Scripture alone*; and have not others of it said as much of the *Consubstantiality* of the *Son* with the *Father*? I am sure *this* was believed before the *Scripture* was written; and so *Scripture* could not be the *Rule* of *believing* it. But then again, what if *Bellarmin* produc'd but *One* Text of *Scripture* for *Transubstantiation*, therefore can there no more be produc'd? Or, if no more could be produc'd, would there not be the *same Ground* of believing from thence, supposing I am certain of the *true sense* of this *One*, as if there were *many*? Are we not bound as much to believe *God* when he says a thing *once*, if we be *sure* of the *true sense* of what he saith, as when he says the same *twice* or *thrice*? And were not all those places cited by *Bellarmin*, *for Christ's Divinity*, as much impugned by the *Arrians*, as this, (of *Christ's words, This is my Body.*) is by *Calvin* and his Complices? Why then must I, because *Bellarmin* produces out of Scripture but *one* Text for *Transubstantiation*, and *many* for *Christ's Divinity*, acknowledge there are not the *same Grounds or Motives to believe the one* as the *other*?

§. 7. I,

§. 7. I, but *Bellarmin* himſelf acknowledges, that *there is ſome obſcurity or ambiguity* in the very *Text* he cites; for after he had ſpent the greateſt part of the Chapter againſt the *Lutherans*, *He concludes it thus*, ſaith the Doctor, p. 131. *Although there* be *ſome obſcurity or ambiguity in the words of our Lord, yet that is taken away by Councils and Fathers, which is a plain Indication he thought, the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation could not be proved from Scripture alone.* But ſtay, am I bound to believe Dr. *St.* upon his bare word? May I not look into *Bellarmin* to ſee what he ſays, without incurring a ſin of raſh judgement againſt my Neighbour? The Book (God be thanked) is not ſo hard to be found, as that of *Trigantius*. I ventur'd to look the place upon the Remembrance of ſome former *dexterity* I had noted in him in citing of *Authors*, and (although I could hardly believe my *Eyes*, nor did not, till I look'd into *another Edition*) I found *Bellarmin* not to ſay what he affirms him to ſay, but in reality the *contrary*. For after he had proved from the words of our Lord, the *Real Preſence* of *his Body* in the *Sacrament* againſt the *Calviniſts*, *li.* 1. *de Euch. c.* 1. and in the preſent Chapter had ſhown againſt the *Lutherans*, that *Tranſubſtantiation is abſolutely inferr'd from the very ſame words*, being

li. 3. *de Euch.* c. 19.

being to carry on his Proofs from *Scripture* to *Councils* and *Fathers*, he concludes the Chapter in these words, and that by way of Transition:

Adde, quod LICET in verbis Domini ESSET *aliqua obscuritas, vel* ambiguitas, *tamen sublata est per multa Concilia Catholica Ecclesiæ, & Patrum Consensum.* *Add*, saith he, *that* ALTHOUGH THERE WERE (*or should be*, which is as much as to say, *suppose there were*) *some obscurity or ambiguity in the words of our Lord, yet that is taken away by the many Councils of the Catholick Church, and the Consent of Fathers.* And now I appeal to the Reader, whether Dr. *St.* have not given us here a very rare example of *reporting faithfully*, (as he calls it in his *Preface*) the *words* and *sense* of an *Author*. Is it all one to say, *although there be*, and *although there should be?* He that saith, *Although there be some ambiguity in the words*, supposes them to be *ambiguous:* He that saith *Although there should be some Ambiguity in them*, supposes them *not* to be *ambiguous*. And this is the case between *Bellarmin* and the *Doctor*. *Bellarmin* only puts the *case* they were ambiguous, and by *so* doing supposes them *not* to be *so:* and the Doctor makes him acknowledge them *de facto* to be *ambiguous:* which is just, as if when the Doctor himself says, (p. 111.) *supposing there were the same*

ſame divine Revelation of Tranſubſtantiation and of Chriſt's Divinity, &c. I ſhould infer, that he acknowledges the *Revelation* to *be* the *ſame*, *de facto*, in both. 'Tis manifeſt then, that by *this Tranſlation* he hath *corrupted* both the *words* and *ſenſe* of *Bellarmin*. And this not by *miſtake*, as appears but too too plainly, for that himſelf makes the words of *Bellarmin*, as he tranſlates them, *to be a plain Indication, that he thought Tranſubſtantiation could not be proved from Scripture alone*; whereas had he *reported* them as they ſtand in *Bellarmin*, (LICET ESSET) *Although there were*, (*or ſhould be*) *ſome ambiguity in the words of our Lord*, &c. They had been a plain *Indication*, that *Bellarmin* for his part thought that he had ſufficiently prov'd the *Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation* out of *Scripture*. And now the Reader ſees what the Doctor meant in his *Preface*, by *his deſign* (as he calls it) *to report faithfully*: And however he intended to make uſe of it for his *advantage*, yet it is *a very plain Indication* of what *ſhifts* and *artifices* they are fain to avail themſelves of, who will maintain *a bad cauſe*. To conclude, I ſhall give *him* the Opinion of Dr. *Taylor* in this Point more faithfully: who in his *Liberty of Prophecying*, Sect. 20. n. 16. ſaith, that *Catholicks have a Divine Revelation*, (*viz.* This is my Body.) *whoſe literal and Grammatical ſenſe, if that were intended*

tended (is ſo clear and evident for Tranſubſtantiation, that it) *would warrant them to do violence to all the Sciences in the Circle.*

CHAP. VI.

Dr. Taylor's *Argument in behalf of Catholicks, ſuppoſing them miſtaken, Un-anſwered by Dr.* St. *His Parallel of ſuch a ſuppoſed miſtake with that of Idolaters, ſhown to be a real and very groſs miſtake in himſelf.*

§. 1. HAving ſhown in my *Reply* that the *Dr's Argument* by which he would prove the *Church* of *Rome* guilty of *Idolatry* for adoring our *Lord Chriſt* in the *Euchariſt*, would be of equal force from the Pen of an *Arrian*, againſt the *adoration* of *him*, as *God*, wherever preſent; I added, (p. 20.) that ſuppoſing *Catholicks ſhould be miſtaken in their belief*, (And I hope the Doctor will not infer from *hence*, that I acknowledge them to *be* miſtaken, *de facto*,) *yet ſo eminent and learned a Man among the Proteſtants, as Dr.* Taylor, denies it would follow from thence, that they were *Idolaters*. And the words I cited were theſe, out of his *Liberty of Prophecying. Sect.* 20. *Numb.* 16. *Idolatry*, ſaith he, *is a forſaking the true God, and*

and giving divine worſhip to a Creature, or to an Idol, that is, to an Imaginary God, who hath no Foundation in Eſſence or Exiſtence: And this is that kind of Superſtition, which by Divines is called, the ſuperſtition of an undue Object. Now it is evident, ſaith he, *that the Object of Catholick's Adoration (that which is repreſented to them in their minds, their thoughts, their purpoſes; and by which God principally, if not ſolely takes Eſtimate of humane Actions) in the B. Sacrament, is the only true and Eternal God, hypoſtatically joined with his Holy Humanity; which Humanity they believe actually preſent under the Veil of the Sacramental Signs; and if they thought him not preſent, they are ſo far from worſhipping the Bread in that caſe, that themſelves profeſs it Idolatry to do ſo, which is a* demonſtration, *that their Soul hath nothing in it, that is, Idolatrical. If their Confidence and fanciful Opinion hath engaged them upon ſo great a miſtake,* (as without doubt, he ſaith, *it hath) yet the Will hath nothing in it, but what is a great Enemy to Idolatry.* Thus Dr. *Taylor*, and I ſaid, *I thought it would be a Task worthy Dr.* St.*'s pains to ſolve this Argument, if he would not abſolve us from being Idolaters.* But it ſeems, he either thought it not *worth his pains*; or rather, that it would be but *labour loſt* to go about it, and therefore endeavours to *ſhift* it off: *Firſt* By *returning us the Opinion of ſome of our own*

Divines

Divines; And, 2*dly*, By ſeemingly oppoſing Dr. *Taylor* to himſelf, though what he cite out of him be nothing to this purpoſe.

§. 2. The *Divines*, whoſe Opinions he returns me, are *Coſter* and Biſhop *Fiſher*. *If the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation be not true,* ſaith *Coſter*, *the Idolatry of the Heathens in worſhiping ſome Golden or Silver Statue, or any Images of their Gods; or the Laplanders worſhipping a Red Cloth, or the Ægyptians an Animal, is more excuſable, than of Chriſtians who worſhip a bit of Bread. And if there be nothing but Bread in the Euchariſt,* ſaith Biſhop *Fiſher*, *they are all Idolaters.* These are the *Teſtimonies* he produces: And what follows from hence? that becauſe they *ſeem* to ſay in effect what he does, therefore the *Reaſon* alledged by Dr. *Taylor* is ſolved? This is a *new way* of *ſolving arguments* not unlike to *his new way* of *anſwering* the *Teſtimonies* of *Fathers* (I ſhewed above, p. 46.) which was to ask me, *How I was ſure, the Fathers had not changed their Judgment in their latter Writings*, when himſelf brings nothing to prove they did. What I required of him in this point was, to *ſolve* the *Argument*, or *abſolve* us from

Enchir. Controv. c. 8. p. 308.

Contr. Oecolamp. li. 1. c. 2.

from *Idolatry*. The *one* he *cannot*, the *other* he *will not do*. Only he tells us that two of our own *Divines* were of the contrary Opinion; as if becauſe *Vaſquez* holds an Opinion contrary to *Suarez*, *that alone* were a ſufficient ſolution to all his Arguments.

As for the Teſtimonies themſelves, they are but the *Opinions* of *Divines*, and ſo I might take the liberty of the *Schools* to deny the conſequence, as Mr. *Thorndike* doth, when he ſaith, that ſuch kind of expreſſions in *Catholick Divines*, [viz. *if there be nothing but Bread in the Euchariſt, they are all Idolaters,*] *ſhow what confidence they would have the World apprehend, that they hold their Opinion with, but not that the Conſequence is true*, viz. that *they are therefore Idolaters, unleſs*, ſaith he, *what I have ſaid above be reprovable*. And what was that, but the ſame which Dr. *Taylor* aſſerted? viz. *That a Mans miſtake in thinking the Elements to be away, (which indeed*, ſaith he, *are there,) cannot make him guilty of honouring thoſe Creatures as God, which we know, if he thought they were there, he muſt needs take for Creatures, and therefore could not honour for God*. And he repeats the ſame again in his *Juſt Weights and Meaſures*, c. 19. where he ſays, that *they who worſhip the Hoſt, do not believe that the Elements remain, nay, they ſay they muſt be flat Idolaters,*

Epil. 3. part. p. 352.

if

if they be there. Zeal to their Opinion makes them say more than they should say. But if they were there, they would not take them for Gods; and that is it, saith he, (*not saying that they should be Idolaters if the Elements did remain*) *that must make them Idolaters.* Thus Mr. *Thorndike*, and justifiably enough, had those Divines proceeded in the Doctor's supposition of formal Idolatry; which upon the best judgment I can make of *Costerus* his words, I have reason to think they did not, but only considered and compared the *Material* Object (Bread) as less worthy of adoration, with the Golden or Silver Statues of the *Heathens*, &c. And this I take to be manifest from *Coster's* discourse, (if entirely set down) which is this, that *if the true Body of Christ be not in the Sacrament of the Eucharist Christ hath dealt with his Church in a manner much unbecoming his Goodness, which was to leave her for 1500. Years together in such an Error and Idolatry, and that occasioned by his own words, as was never seen or heard of in the World. For,* saith he, *the Error of those who worship for God a Golden or a Silver Statue*, &c. *is more tolerable*, (that is, less absurd to any Man's reason) *than of Christians who worship a bit of Bread.* And upon this account it is, he adds, that *ignorance could not excuse such wise and learned Men, as Austin, Chrysostom, Hierom*, &c. for a-

doring the Hoſt (unleſs they were moſt certainly aſſured, that it was *not bread*, but the *Body of Chriſt*) *and that the Heathens were more excuſable from Idolatry, who adored their Statues*, (becauſe *they* muſt needs think them much *more worth* than a *bit of bread*.) By which it appears, that the whole force of his argument lies upon the *Indignity* of the *thing*, (which the Doctor omitted) *viz.* that *Chriſt* by his words ſhould give occaſion to his *Church* to run into ſo *abſurd* an *Error*, (though but *material* only) for ſo long a time together. And conſequently he meddles not at all with the *preſent Queſtion*, whether ſuppoſing *Catholicks* miſtaken in their belief, they would be guilty (as my Adverſary would make them) of *Formal Idolatry*? From whence it follows that Dr. *St.* hath neither ſolved Dr. *Taylor*'s Argument, by which he proves that *Catholicks*, neither *ought* nor *can* be *juſtly* accuſed of *Idolatry*, (that is, of *formal Idolatry*) *ſuppoſing them to be miſtaken in their belief of Tranſubſtantiation, becauſe what is repreſented to them in their minds, their thoughts and purpoſes, (and by which God principally, if not ſolely takes eſtimate of humane Actions) in the B. Sacrament, is not Bread which they believe not to be there at all, but the only true and Eternal God:* Nor yet in *reality* hath return'd us the *Opinion* of our *own Divines*, who were not concerned

concerned in the Queſtion at preſent in debate between us. For they did not conſider the *act*, as it was the *worſhipping God* ſuppoſed to be in the place of *Bread*; but *materially* only, as it was the *worſhipping* the *Bread* for *God*. No relief then is to be had from our Divines. Let us ſee whether the Doctor ſpeed any better in what he cites out of Dr. *Taylor* himſelf; for by his manner of proceeding he would make the Reader believe, that he had anſwer'd his own Argument, when he ſpeaks nothing at all of it.

§. 3. *None*, ſaith he, *is ſo fit to anſwer Dr.* Taylor, *as himſelf, after almoſt Twenty Years time*, (in which alſo he was *advanced* to *Epiſcopal* dignity) *to conſider more throughly of thoſe things*, that is, ſuppoſing *Catholicks* miſtaken in their belief, yet they are *excuſed* from *Idolatry*, as having in their *minds* no other *object* of *Adoration* in the *B. Sacrament*, but the only *true* and *Eternal God*. And what is it that Dr. *St.* hath found in Dr. *Taylor* himſelf *after Twenty Years conſideration* to Anſwer his Argument? Marry this, *that Thou ſhalt not worſhip any Graven Images will out-weigh all the beſt and faireſt Imaginations of the Church of Rome.* And again, that *the Second Commandment is plain and peremptory againſt all the making and worſhipping any Image, or likeneſs of any thing.* And who would not think here, that the Doctor had

forgot, that we were not disputing now about the *worship* of *Images*, but of *Christ* in the *Sacrament*? Had I cited Dr. *Taylor* when I was treating the matter of *Image-worship*, to say, that *the ordinary disputes* between *Catholicks* and *Protestants* (of which certainly that of the *Veneration* of *Images* is *one*) *have to no very great purpose disturbed the Peace of Christendome*; and that *they are superstructures ill built, and worse managed, but yet they keep the Foundation*—*The foundation of Faith*, saith he, *stands secure enough for all their vain and unhandsome superstructures*; the *places* he cites might have serv'd for a kind of *Recantation*, (not to give it the name of *Contradiction*) because if it be *Idolatry* it destroys the *Foundation*. But to tell us that Dr. *Taylor* answers his own Argument, *viz.* (that *Catholicks* in case they should be *mistaken* in the *belief* of *Transubstantiation*, are *not* guilty of *Idolatry*, as having no other *Object* of their *Adoration* in the *Sacrament* but the only *true God*) *because the second Commandment is peremptory against the worship of Images*; is such a trifling evasion, as nothing but *despair* of saying any thing to the *purpose* could have cast so *subtil* a *Discourser* upon it.

Lib. of *Proph. c.* 20. *Numb.* 4.

Ib. Numb. 3.

But

But hath the Doctor nothing here to ſay for himſelf, why he produced theſe *Teſtimonies* of ſo *diſparate* a temper to the preſent purpoſe? Yes. For by theſe Aſſertions of Dr. *Taylor*, *it is clear*, (ſaith he) *he did not think that Idolatry did lye only in giving divine worſhip to a Creature*, p. 133. *or to an Idol, which is called the ſuperſtition of an undue Object; but alſo will have the ſuperſtition of a prohibited manner, or way of Worſhip to be Idolatry. For he not only makes the Second Command peremptory againſt the Worſhip of the true God by an Image, but elſewhere plainly determins this to be Idolatry; as* Doct. dubitant. *when he ſaith*, (and I pray li. 2. c. 2. take notice what it is he ſaith) *that to worſhip falſe Gods, or to give divine honour to an Image* (which only they who take an Image for God do) *is all one kind of formal Idolatry. If therefore*, ſaith Dr. *St.* (and we muſt grant him too, it is all *one*, to worſhip *God* himſelf *by* an *Image*, and to worſhip an *Image* inſtead of *God*; *they cannot be excuſed from Idolatry who worſhip the true God by an Image, though the Object of their Adoration be right, and they think the manner of it lawful; neither can they who worſhip Chriſt upon the account of Tranſubſtantiation in the Sacrament.* This is the Doctor's diſcourſe; and as it muſt coſt him no

little pains to ſqueez ſo ſubtil an Inference from Dr. *Taylor*'s words: So I confeſs, it coſt me ſome to reduce it into ſuch order, as might make it intelligible to the Reader. But the miſchief is, that whilſt he labours thus to *ſolve* the argument, he *confirms* it. For as for the *firſt* part of the diſtinction, Viz. *the Superſtition of an undue Object*, it is evident that *Catholicks* are not guilty of *it* in Dr. *Taylor*'s judgment, becauſe (as Dr. *St.* himſelf confeſſes) he acknowledges the *Object* of *Catholicks Adoration* to be the *only true God*, who, I hope, is no undue Object of our Worſhip. And for the *Second*, viz. *the ſuperſtition of a prohibited manner or way of Worſhip*, he brings nothing out of Dr. *Taylor* to prove the worſhip of *Chriſt* in the *Sacrament* to be *ſo*; but only tells us, (though Dr. *Taylor*'s words, as I noted above, import no ſuch thing) that he determines the *worſhip* of the *true God* by an *Image*, to be *Idolatry*; Neither did Dr. *St.* himſelf hitherto pretend any *Prohibition* to worſhip *Chriſt* in the *Sacrament*, but only that there was no *expreſs Command*, p. 111. for the doing it. So that upon the whole, *Catholicks*, ſuppoſing they were miſtaken in their belief, would not be guilty of *Idolatry* upon *either* of theſe *accounts*; that is, *either* for that *they* had an *undue Object* of worſhip in their thoughts, *or* for that the worſhip of *Chriſt*

Chriſt in the *Sacrament* was *forbidden*. But now,

§. 4. In the *4th*. and laſt place, the Doctor aſſerts, p. 134. that *if a miſtake in this caſe will excuſe Catholicks, it would excuſe the groſſeſt Idolatry in the World*. And to make this out, he tells us of *ſome* (who as St. *Auſtin* relates) *ſaid that Chriſt was the Sun, and therefore worſhipped the Sun*, and would fain underſtand *why they ſhould not be as free from Idolatry as thoſe who are ſuppoſed to be miſtaken in the belief of Tranſubſtantiation?* But the *diſparity* between the *one* miſtake and the *other* is ſo clear, that I ſhall appeal to the Readers, whether I had not juſt reaſon to call the *not ſeeing it* in the Doctor, a very *groſs miſtake*. For what St. *Auſtin* relates of the *Manichees*, (as the Doctor himſelf *reports* it) is, that *they worſhipped* the *Sun*, *whom they* falſly *thought to be Chriſt*: That is, what they had in their *minds* and *purpoſes* to *adore*, was the *Sun*. But *Catholicks* (ſuppoſing a miſtake in their belief) do not believe the *Bread* to be *Chriſt*; or worſhip the *bread* which they believe to be *Chriſt*. No: their miſtake (if there were any) would be, that they believed the *bread not* to be *there* at all; and therefore what *they* would have in their *minds* and *purpoſes* to *adore*, would *not*, nor *could not* be *bread*,

Tract. in Pſ. 93.

but the *only true and Eternal Son of God.* The *difference* then in the *miſtakes* would be *this*, that the *Manichees* had for the *formal* term of their Worſhip, an *undue Object*, viz. a *Creature* inſtead of the *Creator*; but *Catholicks* in caſe of a *miſtake*, would have no other *formal Object* of *Adoration* in their minds, but the *Creator* himſelf. And the *miſtakes* being *ſo different*, it follows they muſt have *as different* an influence upon the *Acts* of *Worſhip*, *i. e.* to make them guilty or not guilty of *formal Idolatry*. But then he moulds the Queſtion anew, and propoſes it in theſe terms, *Whether the worſhipping falſe Gods, ſuppoſing them to* p. 136. *be true, be not as Venial a fault, as worſhipping that for the true God, which is not ſo? As for Inſtance, ſuppoſe the Ægyptians worſhipping the Sun for God, and the Iſraelites the Golden Calf, believing it was the true God, &c. Upon what account,* ſaith he, *ſhall theſe be charg'd with Idolatry, if an Involuntary miſtake and firm belief that they worſhip the true God doth excuſe from it?* And then adds, that *the moſt ſtupid and ſenſleſs of all Idolaters, who worſhipped the very Images for Gods, were in truth the moſt excuſable upon this Ground.* To this I anſwer, that (ſetting aſide the *new diviſion*, he runs upon the *old falſe ground*, that *Catholicks believe the Bread to be God, as the Worſhippers of the Sun believed*

ed the Sun to be God) the *disparity* as to the *miſtakes* is ſtill the *ſame*; becauſe the *Ægyptians* believed and worſhipped the *Sun* for *God*, and ſo did the *Iſraelites* the *Golden Calf*; but *Catholicks* (though ſuppoſed to be *miſtaken* in their belief) would not worſhip the *Bread* for *Chriſt*, becauſe their miſtake would not be in taking the *Bread* for *God*; as the *Ægyptians* did the *Sun*: but in *this*, that they conceived the *Bread* not to be there at all, but in place thereof, *the only true and Eternal God*: And ſo although the *Object*, (or rather *Subject*) *materially* there preſent would in ſuch a caſe be *Bread*, yet their *act* of *adoration* would not be terminated *formally* upon *that*, but upon *God*. For as Dr. *Taylor* ſaith, *if they thought Him not preſent, they are ſo far from worſhipping the Bread in this caſe, that themſelves profeſs it to be Idolatry to do ſo; which is a demonſtration that their Soul hath nothing in it which is Idolatrical.* And if the Doctor ſee not the force of this *demonſtration*, (for *demonſtrations* are very *dazling* Objects to Eyes unus'd to ſo great *Light*) I ſhall lay it yet plainer before him in this *Syllogiſm*. Whatever is taken for an *Object* of Worſhip, the *Underſtanding* muſt affirm (either truly or falſly) to *be*: and therefore neither the *Ægyptians* had worſhipped the *Sun* for *God*, nor the *Iſraelites* the *Calf*, if their underſtanding had not

firſt

first affirmed *them* to *be*: But *Catholicks* whether *miſtaken* or *not* in the belief of *Tranſubſtantiation*, do not in their minds affirm the *Bread* to *be*, but *not* to *be*; becauſe in *both* ſuppoſitions they believe *it* to be *converted* into the *Body* of *Chriſt*; Therefore the *Object* of their *worſhip* is not *Bread*, but *Chriſt* the only *true* and *Eternal Son* of *God*. And thereupon the ſame Dr. *Taylor* (in the place above cited, Numb. 17.) ſaith, *That before they venture to paſs an Act of Adoration, they believe the Bread to be annihilated, or turn'd into his ſubſtance, who may lawfully be worſhipped: And they, who have theſe thoughts, are as much Enemies of Idolatry, as they that underſtand better* (as he thinks he does) *to avoid that Inconvenience, which is ſuppoſed to be the Crime, which they formally hate, and we* (ſaith he) *materially avoid*. When therefore Dr. *St.* upon account that *the miſtake, and firm belief* of the *Ægyptians* and others, [*that what they worſhipped was the true God*] could *not excuſe* them from being guilty of *formal Idolatry*, (becauſe what they had in their *minds* and *purpoſes* to adore, was that *very Creature* which they falſly took for *God*) when I ſay he undertakes to infer from hence, that a *miſtake* in *Catholicks* as to the *material object* preſent in the *Sacrament*, (whereas *what* they would have in their *minds* and *purpoſes* to *adore*, would be no other thing, but the *very true*

true God with *Exclusion* of the *Creature:*) would involve *them* also in the same *crime:* Or, on the contrary, because *such* a *mistake* were *sufficient* to *excuse Catholicks* from the *guilt* of *Idolatry*; therefore *another* quite different, would *excuse* those who directed their *Intention* to the *Worship* of a *Creature*, which they *falsly* deemed to be *God:* Both these *consequences* are so apparently irrational, that nothing but *Animosity* to maintain (*per fas & nefas*) an *angry* charge of *Idolatry* could extort them from a Person, who would be held a *Master* of *that Reason*, as none but *Rats* can Answer. Nevertheless, in vertue of them, He concludes, that *what* he hath said in behalf of the *Heathen Idolaters*, *is the utmost can be said for the Papists adoration of the Host*, *supposing the Doctrine of Transubstantiation were as true*, as he says, *it is false and absurd.* And was *this* then the *Effect* of that great Work of the *Conversion* of this *Nation* to *Christianity* above a Thousand Years ago, that St. *Austin*, and the other *Religious Monks*, who were sent hither with him by St. *Gregory*, only perswaded the People to leave their *old Idolatry* for a *new One*, as *stupid* and *senseless* as the former? Surely no *Christian* Ear can hear this without *horrour.* And the Judgement Mr. *Thorndike* would have made of *this Conclusion*, could have been no other, but that the Author of

it

it (had not Dr. *Stillingfleet* very luckily put his Name to the Book) muſt have been a *Jew* or a *Turk*; when after a ſerious conſideration of *Catholicks adoration* of the *Hoſt*, he concludes in theſe words.

Juſt Weights. c. 19. In fine, *Jews and Mahumetans are bound to take the Worſhip of the Hoſt for Idolatry. For they will needs take the Worſhip of the Holy Trinity for no leſs. But they who know that the God-Head of Chriſt is the Reaſon, for which his Fleſh and Blood is worſhipped in the Euchariſt, cannot take that worſhip for Idolatry, becauſe his Fleſh and Blood is not preſent in the Euchariſt, as they who worſhip it there, think it is. For they know, that the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt is no Idol to Chriſtians, whereſoever it is worſhipped*: Wherefore if Dr. *St.* have no *better arguments* to prove his *Charge* of *Idolatry* with, in this matter, than his own *diſcerning Faculty of Truth or Falſhood in matters propoſed to our belief*, or than *what* he hath ſaid in excuſe of the *moſt ſtupid and ſenſleſs of Heathen Idolaters*, (whoſe *Patronage* he ſeems to have undertaken all along in this Diſcourſe) I muſt conclude his *Reaſons* to be as *falſe* and *abſurd*, as any *Jew* or *Mahumetan* imagins the *Doctrine* of *Tranſubſtantiation* to be.

The End of the Second Part.

THE

THE THIRD PART OF THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

CHAP. I.

The Doctrine of the Church of Rome *in this Point supposed by Dr. St. to be Idolatry, but not proved. The disparity between the Worship given by Catholicks to the Saints, and that of Heathens to their Inferiour Deities, laid open.*

§. 1.

THE *Third Point*, which Dr. *St.* fix'd upon, as a fit Subject to show his wit in proving the *Church* of *Rome* to be guilty of *Idolatry*, is the *Invocation of Saints*. And that the Reader may see what a *prodigious stock* of that Faculty is necessary to make

make it out, I ſhall firſt ſet down the *Doctrin* of the *Church*, as it ſtands recorded in the *Council* of *Trent*. What that *Council* teaches, is: that, *It is good and profitable for Chriſtians humbly to invocate the Saints, and to have recourſe to their Prayers, aid and aſſiſtance, wher by to obtain benefits of God by his Son our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour.* Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 25. Theſe are the very words of the *Council*, and any Man *but* of *common Reaſon*, would think it were as eaſy to prove *Snow* to be *black*, as ſo *Innocent* a practice to be *Idolatry*, even *Heathen Idolatry*. What we *teach* and *do* in this matter, is to *deſire* the *Saints* in Heaven to *pray for us*, as we deſire the *prayers* of *one another* upon *Earth*; and muſt we for this be compared to *Heathens?* Do we not acknowledg that *Jeſus Chriſt*, the *Son* of *God*, is our *only Redeemer* and *Saviour?* Do we not confeſs that what *Benefits* we obtain of *God* either by our *own* or *others Prayers*, muſt come by the *merits* of *Him* our *only Redeemer?* Do we not believe that *God* needs neither our *own Prayers*, nor the *Prayers* of *others*, to confer his *Benefits* upon us; but that all the *need* is on our part, and all that we can do either by our *own Prayers*, or humbly begging the *Prayers of others*, is little enough to make us capable of his *Favours?* Do we not

not profeſs to all the World that we look upon the *Saints*, not as *Gods*, but as the *Friends* and *Servants* of *God*, that is, as *juſt Men*, whoſe *Prayers* therefore are *available* with him? And that we *worſhip* them *only* with that *worſhip* of *Love* and *Communion*, with which even in this life alſo *Holy men* of *God* are *worſhipped*, whoſe hearts we judge prepared to loſe their Lives for the *truth* of the *Goſpel*? Where then lies the *Heatheniſm*? Where lies the *Idolatry*? Had the Doctor held himſelf to the *Doctrine* of the *Church* of *England*, which terms the *Invocation of Saints*, *a fond thing vainly invented and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture*; there had been ſome colour for a diſpute againſt the *lawfulneſs* of it. But to condemn us of *Idolatry*, down-right *Idolatry* for deſiring the *Servants* of *God* in Heaven to *pray for us*, was to put the common ſize of Intelligent Readers quite out of hopes of ever ſeeing it proved. He ſays indeed in his Preface, that *He thinks it no great skill to make things appear either ridiculous or dark*: and here He gives us a very pregnant Example, of what himſelf can do in that kind.

§. 2. The Argument he made choice of to do this *Feat*, that is, to prove the *Church* of *Rome* guilty of *Idolatry* in the *Invocation* of *Saints*, was this. *If the ſuppoſition of a middle excellency between God and us, be ſufficient*

ground

ground for formal Invocation, then the Heathens worſhip of their inferiour Deities could be no Idolatry, for they ſtill pretended they did not give to them the worſhip proper to the ſupreme God; which is as much as is pretended by the devonteſt Papiſts in Juſtification of the Invocation of Saints. To this I anſwer'd two ways in my *Reply*: 1. *By ſhewing the diſparity of Catholicks worſhip from that of the Heathens, in two things*: 1. *In the Objects*; where I ſaid, that by *Perſons of a middle excellency, we underſtand Perſons endowed with ſupernatural gifts of grace in this life, and glory in Heaven, whoſe Prayers by conſequence are acceptable and available with God. But the ſupreme Deity of the Heathens, is known to be Jupiter, and their inferiour Deities, Venus, Mars, Bacchus, Vulcan, and the like rabble of Devils, as the Scripture calls them; and therefore there can be no conſequence, that becauſe the Heathens were Idolaters in the worſhip of theſe though they pretended not to give them the worſhip proper to Jupiter the ſupreme God; therefore Catholicks muſt be guilty of Idolatry in deſiring the ſervants of the true God to pray for them to him.* 2. *In the manner of worſhip, becauſe I ſaid, if any of the Heathens did attain (as the Platoniſts) to the knowledge of the true God, yet as St.* Paul *ſaith, they did not glorify him as God, but changed his glory into an Image made like to corruptible Man, adoring*

and

and offering ſacrifice, due to God alone, to the Statues themſelves, or the inferiour Deities they ſuppoſed to dwell or aſſiſt in them; which St. Auſtin, *upon the* 96. Pſalm, *proves to be Devils, or evil Angels, becauſe they required ſacrifice to be offered to them, and would be worſhipped as Gods. What he meant by formal Invocation, I ſaid I did not well underſtand, but Catholicks, I told him, underſtand no more by it in this matter, but deſiring or praying the Saints to pray for them. And if this were Idolatry, we muſt not deſire the Prayers of a juſt Man, even in this life, becauſe this formal Invocation will be to make him an Inferiour Deity.* 2. *I anſwer'd, that the ſame Calumny was caſt upon the Catholicks in* St. Auſtin's *time, and is anſwered by him, and his Anſwer will ſerve as well now as then, in his Twentieth Book againſt Fauſtus,* Chap. 21. *who himſelf held ſuch formal Invocation a part of the Worſhip due to Saints, as is evident from the Prayer he made to* St. Cyprian *after his Martyrdome, l.* 7. *de Bapt. c. Donat. c.* 1. *And* Calvin *himſelf confeſſeth it was the cuſtome at that time to ſay, Holy* Mary, *or Holy* Peter *pray for Us.*

This indeed was my Anſwer, and to diſprove it, he undertakes to ſhow two things: 1. *That the diſparity between Catholicks worſhip of Saints, and the Heathens worſhip of their inferiour Deities, is not*

p. 139.

ſo great as to excuſe them from Idolatry. 2. *That the Anſwer given by* St. Auſtin *doth not vindicate them now, as well as then.*

§. 3. 1. Concerning the *diſparity*; 1. *As to the Object of Worſhip*, he abhors from his heart *to parallel the Holy Angels and Saints with the impure Deities of the Heathens, as to their Excellencies.* No. He hath more honour for them than not to think them *more excellent*, than *Devils*, or *wicked Wretches*: I ſuppoſe in caſe they have the teſtimony of *Scripture* for their *ſanctity*; otherwiſe it may go hard with the beſt of them, ſhould he proceed in the ſame form with all the reſt, as he doth a little below with St. *Ignatius*. But ſuppoſing them at preſent to be *more excellent*, than the *impure Deities* of the *Heathens*, yet *if the Idolatry of the Heathens*, ſaith he, *lay not only in this, that they worſhipped Jupiter, and Venus, and Vulcan, who are ſuppoſed to have been wicked Wretches; but in this, that they gave Divine Worſhip to any, beſides God, then this diſparity cannot excuſe Catholicks from being Idolaters.* Behold here the *ground* upon which he intends to *build* his *Charge* of *Idolatry*, Viz. *That Catholicks give divine honour to the Holy Angels and Saints.* This is what the Reader *muſt ſuppoſe*, otherwiſe his Arguments are at an End; and having laid this *falſe* and ſcandalous ſuppoſition, inſtead

inſtead of proving it, he undertakes to ſhow out of the *Primitive Fathers, that it was the Property of the Chriſtian Religion to give divine worſhip to none, but God himſelf and his Son Chriſt Jeſus.* To this purpoſe he cites *Juſtin Martyr*, and *Theophilus* Biſhop of *Antioch*, to whom he ſays he might add, *if it were requiſite in ſo Evident a matter*, the teſtimonies of *Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, Athenagoras, Lactantius, Arnobius*, (and who not, that ever pretended to the Name of Chriſtian?) *who all agree that Religious* (by which he means *divine*) *worſhip is proper to the true God, and that no created Being is capable of it*; and in this ſtrain he runs on for no leſs than Ten Leaves together: and at length without ever proving that *Catholicks do give divine worſhip to the Holy Angels and Saints*, he moſt triumphantly concludes them to be *Idolaters*. This is the ſumme of his performance, and by it I underſtand that it had been no *great skill* in the *Phariſees*, to have made any of thoſe Perſons who *honoured* St. *Peter*, or St. *Paul*, when they were upon Earth, or *deſired their Prayers*, to be *Idolaters*. They needed not any other proof, but only to *ſuppoſe* confidently, that *they gave to them the worſhip proper to God alone*, and the work was done; eſpecially if they had but cited that Text of Scripture, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the*

Lord thy God, and Him only ſhalt thou ſerve. I confeſs when I ſaid, that I thought it would be as eaſy to prove *Snow* to be *black*, as the *Doctrine* of the *Catholick Church* in this matter, to be *Idolatry*; I did not reflect, that Dr. *St.* might *ſuppoſe Catholicks to give divine worſhip to the Saints*, and ſo conclude them to be *Idolaters*. But this, (as I now remember) is a Peculiar Topick, of which all thoſe who oppoſe the *Faith* of the *Church*, are forced to make uſe; Viz. to ſuppoſe *her Doctrine* not to be *what ſhe affirms*, but what *they would have her to affirm*, and from thence to make her guilty of what *Crimes* and *Enormities* they p caſe themſelves.

§. 4. Now although the Teſtimonies of the Fathers he alledges, are ſo impertinent to the preſent Queſtion, as I have ſhewed, yet becauſe ſome of them, as they are *imperfectly* reported, or *advantageouſly tranſlated* by him, may give occaſion to an unwary *Reader* to ſuſpect, that they meant to deny that *any worſhip at all was to be given to any beſides God*: I ſhal take the pains to unfold their meaning, and free him from any ſuch Jealouſy, by ſhowing that when they deny in general terms *worſhip* to be given to a *Creature*, they mean *divine worſhip*, which is due to *God* alone; and not that *worſhip* which is given to *Men*, upon account either of their *Natu-*

ral

ral or *Supernatural* Endowments; or for the *Place* or *Office* they hold in the *Church* or *Common-Wealth*. For as there is a worſhip due to *Men* for the *former*; ſo alſo doubtleſs for the *latter*. And we have an Example of it in Dr. *St.* himſelf, in his *Irenicum*, p. 413. [Printed at *London*, *An.* 1662.] Where, ſpeaking of Mr. *Baxter*, he calls him, *Our Reverend and Learned Mr.* Baxter: *Learned*, I ſuppoſe for his *knowledge*; but *Reverend* for his *Piety*, and *Place* in the *Preſbytery*, and ſo worthy of *double*, if not of *treble* honour.

Thus much premiſed of the *different degrees* there are of worſhip, as alſo that it is a thing notoriouſly known, that many of the *Heathen Emperors* exacted to be worſhipped as *Gods*, that is, with *divine worſhip*;

The Teſtimony out of *Juſtin Martyr* (p. 141.) anſwers it ſelf, becauſe where he tells the *Emperours*, *that Chriſt did perſwade Men to worſhip God alone*, &c. He preſently adds, that *the ſame Chriſt commanded Chriſtians to give unto Cæſar the things which are Cæſars*, of which *Honour* is One, in the Judgment of St. *Peter*. And the like had been manifeſt of *Theophilus Antiochenus*, if the Doctor had fairly ſet down his words, for he expreſly

Apol. 2.

1 Pet. 2.

Theophil. ad Autol. li. 1.

affirmeth, that although *the King was not ordained to be adored, yet He was to be honour'd with that lawful worſhip, which belongs to Him.* And this is inſinuated in the very words cited by the Doctor himſelf. [viz. *as the King ſuffers none under him to be called by his Name, nor is it lawful to give it to any,* but *himſelf, ſo neither is it to worſhip any but God alone*] for although the *King* will ſuffer none under him to be called by his *Name* yet he requires that *reſpect* be given to thoſe whom he conſtitutes *Judges* and *Magiſtrates* under Him, according to their degree and quality. And *God* himſelf, although he forbid to give his own *Name* or *Honour* to any but Himſelf, yet he commands us to give *honour* to whom *honour* is *due*, Rom. 13. 7. And that this was the meaning both of *Theophilus* and *Juſtin*, we need no better Expoſitor than *Tertullian*, who was neer upon contemporary with them; and tells us that *the King is then to be honoured, when he keeps himſelf within his own Sphere, and abſtains from divine honours*; *Quum a divinis honoribus longe eſt.* So that I cannot but wonder, what the Doctor meant by alledging theſe *Teſtimonies* of thoſe *two* ancient *Fathers*, unleſs he intend to deny *any worſhip* at all to be *due* to *any* beſides *God*; or that he think it not poſſible to worſhip a *good* Man for his *vertue*

Scorpiac. c. 14.

and

and *ſanctity*, but we muſt give him *divine honour*. If he produc'd them for no other End, but to ſhow that we ought not to give *divine worſhip* to any created Being whatſoever, it is evident they are *not* at all to the *purpoſe*, it being far from the minds and hearts of *Catholicks* to give *that honour* to the *Saints*.

§. 5. But then the old ſcruple returns again, *Why he may not as well honour God by giving worſhip to the Sun, as to Ignatius Loyola, or St. Francis, or any other late Canoniz'd Saint!* (He might have added, if he had pleas'd, or to one not yet Canonized, *his Reverend Mr. Baxter?*) *For he is ſure the Sun* (and why not the moſt Reverend Sun?) *is a certain Monument of God's Goodneſs, Wiſdome and Power, and he cannot be miſtaken therein, but he can never be certain of the Holineſs of thoſe Perſons, he is to give divine Worſhip to.* Thus Dr. *St.* And certainly he muſt believe his Readers to be all *ſtark blind*, who cannot diſtinguiſh the *Reverence* due to a Perſon for his *Holineſs*, from *Divine Worſhip*: or that a *Saint* is not a *greater Monument of GOD's Goodneſs, Wiſdome and Power*, than the *Sun*. But by his particularizing the late *Canoniz'd Saints*, it ſeems he is ſatisfied, that St. *Peter*, and St. *Paul* were greater *Monuments* of the *Divine Goodneſs, Wiſdome*, and *Power*, p. 143.

than the *Sun*; that *more* were raiſed to love *God* by ſeeing the *light* of their *example*, than by gazing upon that *bright Planet*: and conſequently, that we may much better honour *God* by giving worſhip to *them*, at leaſt, than to the *Sun*; and perhaps to St. *Francis* too, becauſe he is ſo kind as to honour him here with the title of *Saint*. But his quarrel, I perceive, is particularly to *Ignatius Loyola*, (as he irreverently calls him) *who for ought he can know*, (he ſays) *was a great hypocrite, but he is ſure the Sun is none*. And whether will his *ſpight* againſt the *Saints*, at length hurry him, if we may not *honour* a Man for the great Vertue and Piety, which appears in him, becauſe *for ought we can know*, he is a *hypocrite?* What if the like ſcruple ſhould poſſeſs his mind in order to St. *Hierome*, St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Auſtin*, and the reſt of the Primitive *Saints?* It were but to ſay of *them*, what he doth of St. *Ignatius*, that *for ought he can know, they were great hypocrites*: For, *He knows the beſt of Men have their corruptions, and to what degree it is impoſſible to underſtand, but he is certain the ſpots in the Sun are no moral impurities, nor diſpleaſing to God.* And may he not ſay the ſame of the *Martyrs* too, that *for ought he knows*, they did not lay down their lives purely for the *truth* of the *Goſpel*, but perhaps becauſe they were *weary* of them, or for *vain glory*, or out of *obſti-*

nacy,

nacy, not to yield to their Adverſaries? If, I ſay, ſuch a *ſcruple* as this ſhould come into his mind, what poſſibility were there of his ever being freed from it, but by *Divine Revelation*? Yet ſome Aſſiſtance I may perhaps give him, by letting him ſee the *unreaſonableneſs* of the *ſcruple*, by the *abſurdneſs* of the Conſequences, which muſt follow upon it. For if it be not lawful to honour a Saint, ſuppoſed to be in Heaven, becauſe *for ought he can know, he was a great hypocrite upon Earth*; it follows by the ſame *Rule*, that we may not *honour* any Perſon in this Life, for the *grace* of *God* which ſhines in his *life* and *converſation*, for fear we ſhould honour an *Hypocrite* for a *Saint*. And I ſhould adviſe *him* by *no means* to preach *this Doctrine* to his *Auditors*, leaſt they ſhould entertain the ſame *ſcruple* of *Him*, which he doth of the *Saints* now raigning with *God* in *Glory*. O, but they are the *late Canoniz'd Saints*, that he is not in perfect Charity with (for if he were, he would never *refuſe* to *honour* them, upon a *meer whimſy*, that *for ought he can know*, they were great *Hypocrites*:) and *Philip Nerius*, he ſaith, *could not be miſtaken in the ſhining of the Sun, although he might be in the ſhining of Ignatius his face, which yet is thought ſo conſiderable a thing*, (it ſeems it was not the only thing) *that it is read in the Leſſons of the Roman Breviary*. But whoever conſi-

ders

ders the *care* and *diligence*, uſed at this Day by the *Church* of *Rome*, in examining the *Lives*, and *Actions*, and *Miracles* of thoſe Perſons whom She *Canonizes*, ſhall find it every way as great, if not greater than in the *Primitive* times. I muſt confeſs the *Dr.*'s deſperate ſcruple of *For ought he can know*— is able to defeat the greateſt diligence Imaginable: and ſo no doubt it had the *dedication* of that *Church* in the *Weſt*, ſome years ago, in *Memory* of our late Royal Soveraign *K. Charles* I. had it depended upon his deciſive Vote. As for the *ſhining* of S. *Ignatius* his *face*, he is *not* the *firſt* whom *God* vouchſafed to honour with that outward *ſign* of the *Grace* which *ſhined* in his Soul; and although the *Roman Breviary* make mention of it only upon the Teſtimony of *Philip Nerius*, yet that *Philip Nerius* is known to have been a Man of that *ſanctity* and *integrity*, that he would not have *ſtained* his own *Soul*, to caſt a *falſe light* upon another Man's *face*. I am ſure, *though the ſpots in the Sun are no Moral Impurities, nor diſpleaſing to God*; yet ſuch *groundleſs ſuſpitions*, and *raſh judgments* againſt Perſons of ſo *eminent* and *approved* Vertue, muſt needs be highly *diſpleaſing* to him. What he adds of *giving worſhip to Kings and their ſtatues, as well as to Saints and their Images*, is altogether impertinent, for if he mean *divine worſhip*, we deny it may lawfully

lawfully be given to either of them; and if he ſpeak of *ſuch worſhip* as may be given to *Men*, I would willingly underſtand, why the *Saints* may not be honoured as the *adopted Children of God*, as well as *Kings* for that they are his *Vice-gerents*? I would alſo willingly underſtand yet farther, whether he allow any honour at all to be due to *Princes* upon *that account*; for I do not remember hitherto any paſſage in him, (though he have had frequent occaſion to ſpeak of them) from whence I could gather, that he holds it *lawful* to give *any worſhip* either to their *ſtatues*, or to *themſelves*. And upon the ſame Principles that he denies *any* to be due to the *Saints*, a *Quaker* would prove that it muſt be denied to *Princes*.

§. 6. What hitherto hath been alledged by the Doctor, to prove us guilty of *Idolatry*, it ſeems was not ſo full to the purpoſe, as himſelf could wiſh it, and therefore he will now come home to the caſe. And this it is. *The Heathens were not ſuch Fools, as ſome would make them*: (nor yet altogether *ſo wiſe* as *he* would make them, if we may believe the *Fathers*,) *to excuſe themſelves*: *For*, *though* (ſaith he) *they gave worſhip to ſome, whom they conſider'd as the greateſt Benefactors to Man-kind, yet ſtill they acknowledged one ſupreme God, not* p. 145

Jupiter

Jupiter of Creet, but the Father of gods and men: Only they ſaid, this ſupreme God being of ſo high a Nature, and there being other Intermediate Beings between Him and men, whoſe Office they conceived it was, to carry the Prayers of Men to God, and to bring down help from Him to them, they thought it very fitting to addreſs their ſolemn ſupplications to them. Here now, ſaith he, *is the very ſame caſe in debate, (altering only the Names of Things) which is between us and the Church of Rome, and if ever they ſpeak home to our caſe, they muſt do it upon this Point. And ſo they do, but very little to their comfort.* Here then we muſt fix our *Foot*, and if we can ſhow the *caſe not* to be the *ſame*, we ſhall by his own Confeſſion ſpeak home to the Point; and we ſhall more-over have this *comfort* at leaſt, that we *ſuffer this reproach* (of being paralleld to *Heathens*) *falſly*, for *God*'s ſake. In order to this I ſhall ſhow, 1. What the *ſupreme God* of the *Heathens* was. 2. What were thoſe *Intermediate Beings*. 3*dly*. What was their *Office*; And, 4*thly*, What kind of *ſervice* they required.

1. For the *ſupreme God Jupiter*, the Doctor ſays, *it was not he of Creet, but the Father of gods and men.* And the *Poets* indeed call him ſo, (of whom *Horace* confeſſeth, that they took the priviledge to dare to fain and ſay any thing.) But how *glorious* ſoever the

Title

Title be, yet *Origen* tells us in expreſs terms, that he was not the *true God*, but a *Devil*. *We are ready to undergo*, ſaith he, *any torments rather than confeſs Jupiter to be God, for we do not believe Jupiter and Sabaoth to be the ſame, neither indeed to be any God at all, but a Devil, who is delighted with the name of Jupiter, an Enemy to Men and God.* *li.5. contr. Celſ. p. 487.* 2*dly*, For the *Intermediate Beings*, it is aſſerted by the ſame *Origen*, that they were *Devils* alſo, and according to the differently-formed *ſtatues*, in which they aſſiſted, *one* was eſteemed to be *Bacchus*, another *Hercules*, &c. *li. 8. cont. Celſ. p. 525.* The like is affirmed alſo by *Theophilus Antiochenus* above cited, and St. *Auſtin* upon the 96. *Pſalm.* But then becauſe *the ſupreme God was conceived to be of ſo high a Nature*, that he knew not what paſſed in this ſublunary World: Therefore, 3*dly*, The *Office* of theſe *Inferiour Deities* or *Devils*, was *to carry up the Prayers of Men to God* (as the Doctor himſelf cites out of St. *Auſtin*, but very inſincerely, for St. *Auſtin* ſaith, not to *God*, but *ad Deos*, to the *Gods*, that is, to *Devils*,) *out of a ſuppoſition, that they cannot know the neceſſities and prayers of Men, but by Intervention of* *li.8. de Civ. Dei. c. 14. 18. 21.*

theſe

these Spirits; and so to bring down to Men the blessings they prayed for: And, 4thly, To oblige them to perform this *Office* of *Nuncii* or Messengers, (as St. *Austin* calls them,) they exacted of Men to give them *Divine Worship*, by the Oblation of *Victims* and *Sacrifices*, as the *Fathers* every where testify. This then is the *Scheme* of the *Heathens Divinity* and *Devotion*. The Doctor's *Father* of Gods and *Men*, was according to the *Fathers*, an *Arch-Devil*; The *Inferiour Deities*, were *Inferiour Devils*. Their *Office* was to *inform* the *Superiour Gods*, of what passed here below; and the *reward* they required for this service, was no less than the *Offering* of *Sacrifice* to their *Devil-ships*. And now, was this the *very same case* (*altering only the Names of Things*) *which*, he saith, *is in debate between Him and the Church of Rome concerning the Invocation of Saints?* Surely, a more *Injurious Calumny* scarce ever dropt from the Pen of the greatest Enemy of *Christianity*, except that of *Julian* the *Apostate*, who charged the *Christians* of his time for their worshipping the *Martyrs*, that *for the one true God, they worshipped many Men who were not Gods.* A most Injurious Calumny, I say. For, 1. The *God*, whom we adore, is not that

De Civ. Dei. li. 8. c. 21.

As St. *Cyril Alex.* reports of him. *li. 6. contr. Julian.*

that wiſe *Father of Gods and Men*, who was ſo *high*, as not to know what was done here below; but the *true* and *Immortal God*, *Maker of Heaven and Earth*, who ſees the ſecrets of our hearts, and knows our neceſſities before we utter them. 2*dly*, The *Perſons* to whom we addreſs our ſelves for their Prayers, are not *Devils* or *wicked Wretches*, but the *Friends* and *Servants* of *God*, whom the Doctor himſelf (as little reſpect as he hath for them) acknowledges to exceed *thoſe other* in *excellency*. 3*dly*, Their *Office* is not to inform the *Supream God* of what he knows not, but to be *Joynt Petitioners* with us, and for us, to his *divine Majeſty*, as other *Holymen* are upon Earth. 4*thly*, and Laſtly, We do not procure, or buy this favour of them, by offering *Sacrifice* to them; for as St. *Auſtin* ſaith, *What Biſhop officiating at the Altar, doth ſay at any time, We offer to Thee Peter, or Paul, or Cyprian?* But, as the ſame Holy Doctor there ſaith, *We celebrate their Memory with Religious Solemnity, both to excite us to their imitation, and to become partakers of their Merits and Prayers: but ſo that we erect Altars not to any of the Martyrs but to the God of Martyrs, although in Memory of them.*

Cont. Fauſt. li. 20. c. 21.

And now having ſpoken thus *home* to the *Caſe*, I leave it to the Reader's Judgment, whether

whether the *Practice* of *Catholicks* in *honouring* and *Invocating* the *Saints*, be the *same* with that of the *Heathens*, in the *worship* of their *Inferiour Deities?* To make the Case run Parallel on all four, the Doctor must prove, either that the *God* we *worship* is not the very *true God*, but an *Arch-Devil*; or that the *Holy Angels* and *Saints* are not *his friends* and *servants*, but *inferiour Devils*; Or that we believe *him* to be *so ignorant*, that he stands in *need* of *them* to *inform* him; or that we offer *sacrifice* and erect *Altars* to *them*. And when he can do *all*, or *any* of these, he will speak something to the Point. But I believe *these* are none of those *things*, *which he threatens largely to prove*, *if further occasion be given*. And I have good reason to believe so, by his present undertaking, which is not to prove any of these things (in which the *Parallel* must consist, if there be any,) but to cast a *mist* before his Readers eyes, and make him lose both his *labour*, and the *Question*, as I shall show in the following Chapter.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

What kind of Honour Catholicks give to the Saints. The Testimonies of Origen, *and St.* Ambrose *explained. Of the Practice of making Addresses to particular Saints.*

§. 1. THe *Question* at present between Dr. *St.* and the *Church* of *Rome*, is not whether *divine worship* be to be given to the *Saints*, (for this is abhor'd of all faithful *Christians*) but whether an *Inferiour Worship*, of like kind with that which is given to *Holy Men* upon *Earth* for their *Holiness* and neer *Relation* to *God*, may not be lawfully given to *them*, now they are in *Heaven*? This is the *true state* of the *Question* between us, which the Doctor, afraid to grapple with, turns aside, and will (he saith) *insist upon these two things.*

1. *That the Fathers did condemn all such kind of worship, supposing their Principle true*, that is, as far as I can understand it, supposing what they said was *true.* p. 146.

2. *That they did not only condemn it, in those spirits, which the Heathens worshipped, but in good Angels themselves.* And before I engage with Him upon the *Testimonies* of the

Fathers, I must disperse the Mist he raises by his Egregious *equivocating* in the *words*, *All such kind of worship*. What kind of worship is it the *Fathers* deny may be given to *the most excellent created Beings?* He tells us, (p. 145.) *any Religious Worship*. And what doth he mean by *Religious Worship? To dispute*, (saith Mr. *Thorndike*) *whether we are bound to honour the Saints or not, were to dispute whether we are to be Christians, and to believe this or not. Whether this be Religious or Civil, nothing but equivocation of words makes disputable, and the cause of that equivocation the want of words; vulgar use not having provided words properly to signify conceptions, which came not from Common sense.* —— *Plainly their excellence, and the Relation we have to them, being intelligible only by Christianity, must borrow a Name from that, which vulgar language attributes to God, or to Men our Superiours.* And then a little after he saith, *That the Relation which God hath settled between the Church Militant and Triumphant may be reasonably called Religious, provided that the distance be not confounded between the Religious honour of God, and that Honour of the Creature, which the Religious honour of God enjoins, being neither Civil nor Humane, but such as a Creature is capable of for Religion's sake, and that Relation which it settleth.*

Epil. part. 3. p. 353.

ſettleth. By this it appears, that if the Doctor mean by *Religious Worſhip*, that *Honor* which is due to *God* alone, it is *true* what the *Fathers* ſay, that *It is not to be given to the moſt excellent created Beings*, but nothing at all to the Point in debate between us. If he mean, *that Honour of which a Creature is capable of for Religion's ſake, and that Relation which it ſettleth*, I ſhall ſhow it to be *falſe* that the *Fathers* deny any *ſuch honour* to be given to the *Holy Angels* and *Saints*. And if he contend that this kind of worſhip ought not to be called *Religious*, St. *Auſtin* will tell him, that it is but a meer wrangling about words, becauſe the word *Religion*, as he ſhows, may be uſed in *other ſenſes*, beſides that of the *worſhip due to God*; and Himſelf ſpeaking of the *honour* given by *Chriſtians* to the *Martyrs*, ſaith, *We celebrate their Memories with Religious Solemnity*. And, *who ſo* (ſaith Mr. *Thorndike* in the place above cited) *could wiſh, that the Memories of the Martyrs, and other Saints who lived ſo, as to aſſure the Church they would have been Martyrs, had they been called to it*, (Alas, He never thought that, for ought Dr. *St.* can know, they were great Hypocrites) *had not been honoured, as is plain they were honoured by Chriſtians, muſt find in his heart*

de Civit. Dei: li.10. c.1.

Contr. Fauſt. li.20.c.21.

by consequence, to wish that Christianity had not prevailed. Whether this Censure of Mr. *Thorndike's* be applicable to my Adversary, or no, depends upon his allowing, or not allowing such honour to the *Saints*, as is plain was given them by *Christians*; but for the distinction he makes between the *Religious worship due* to *God*, and *that of which a Creature is capable of for Religion's sake*, it will clearly dispell the *Mist* he hath raised from the *Testimonies* of the *Fathers*: and let the Reader see, how he hath *perverted* their meaning, and yet said nothing to the purpose.

§. 2. The first he cites is *Origen*, affirming, that *the Scripture doth indeed stile God, the God of Gods, and Lord of Lords, but withall saith, that to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ by whom are all things, and we by Him* ___ *And his mind ascends up to the supreme God who worships him inseparably and indivisibly by his Son, who alone conducts us to the Father. Therefore seeing there are many Gods, and many Lords, we endeavour by all means not only to carry our minds above those things on Earth, which are worshipped by the Heathen for Gods, but above those whom the Scripture calls Gods,* by which *Origen* means the *Angels*. To this I answer, that

Contr. Cels. li. 8. in princ.

that it is plain from the very words themſelves, that the worſhip which *Origen* here contends, ought not to be given to *Angels*, is *divine worſhip* proper to God alone; for he ſpeaks only of *that worſhip*, which is given to the *Father inſeparably and indiviſibly by his Son*. And when-ever *ſuch worſhip* is to be given, we muſt not only carry our minds above thoſe things which were worſhipped by the *Heathens* for *Gods*, but above the good *Angels* alſo, becauſe they are not *inſeparably* and *indiviſibly One* with the *Father*, as the *Son* is, who alone can conduct us by his *Grace* and *Merits* to the *Father*. And this is yet more plain from the Reply, which *Origen* gave to that Evaſion of *Celſus*, *viz.* that *None were to be honoured for Gods, but thoſe to whom the ſupreme God doth communicate it*; for, denying any ſuch honour to have been granted by God to the *Heroes* or *Dæmons* of the *Heathens*, he proves from *Miracles*, and *Prophecies*, and *Precepts*, that this honour was given to *Chriſt*, *Ut omnes honorent Filium, ſicut Patrem honorant*, that *all ſhould honour the Son, as they honour the Father*, that is, that they ſhould honour him as *God*, which the Doctor tranſlates *that they who honour the Father, ſhould honour the Son alſo*; tacitly inſinuating that no honour at all might be lawfully given, but to the Son. And again, when *Celſus* objects, *that by the*

ſame Rule that Chriſtians gave honor to Chriſt, he thought they might give it to Inferiour Deities: The account which *Origen* gives of the worſhip which *Chriſtians* attribute to the Son, [viz. *becauſe it is ſaid, I and my Father are One.*] makes it yet more evident, that he ſpeaks of *divine worſhip*, which cannot be given to any created Beings; and not of ſuch an *Inferiour Worſhip*, of which Creatures are capable upon account of their *Holineſs* and *Relation* to *God*. For of *theſe* he ſaith (and who will not wonder to ſee it cited, though but imperfectly, by the Doctor himſelf) *that if Celſus had ſpoken of the true Miniſters of God after his only begotten Son, ſuch as Gabriel, Michael, and all the Angels and Archangels, and had contended that they were to be worſhipped:* (which laſt words, though very material, are left out by Dr. *St.*) *he acknowledges that by explaining the notion of worſhip or reſpect, and the Actions of thoſe that give it, perhaps he ſhould have ſaid ſomething of that Subject, as far as the dignity of ſo great a thing, and the reach of his underſtanding would have permitted.* But *this* not being objected by *Celſus*, but only that they were by the *ſame Rule* by which they worſhipped *Chriſt* for *God*, to worſhip in like manner the *Inferiour Deities* of the *Heathens*, he thought it not neceſſary to enlarge upon that Subject at preſent, but only

p. 148.

only to ſhow the different account upon which they worſhipped *Chriſt*, as one with his *Father*. By which it is manifeſt he held a certain *worſhip* or *reſpect* due to the *Angels*, *inferiour* to that, which is due to *God* alone. And all that the Doctor hath to ſay for himſelf, is that *Origen* ſaith elſe where, *Although the Angels be called Gods in Scripture, yet we are not to worſhip them with divine worſhip:* which is a plain confeſſion, that when *Origen* denies *worſhip* to any created Beings, he ſpeaks of *divine worſhip*, and ſo nothing againſt that *Inferiour worſhip* or reſpect which is given by *Catholicks* to the *Holy Angels* and *Saints*. *li.* 5. *contr. Celſ.*

§. 3. But now the Doctor would ſeem to ſay ſomething to the purpoſe, when he tells us, that *Origen utterly denies, that our Prayers are to be offered to any but Chriſt alone, and that any word which is proper to Religious worſhip, is to be attributed to the Angels themſelves.* But he does but ſeem to come home to the Point; for as Mr. *Thorndike* well obſerves, *The termes of Prayer, Invocation, calling upon, and whatever elſe we can uſe, are or may be in deſpite of our hearts, equivocal; that is, we may be conſtrained, unleſs we uſe that diligence, which common* *li.* 8. *contr. Celſ.* *Epil. part.* 3. *p.* 353

discretion counts superfluous, to use the same words in signifying requests made to God and to Men. And a little after. *Prayer, Invocation, calling upon, is not so proper to God, but that whether you will or not, every Petition to a Prince or Court of Justice, is necessarily a Prayer: and he that makes it, Invocates or Calls upon that Prince or Court for favour, or for Justice.* The Notion then of *Prayer* may be distinguished, as well as that of *Worship:* and *Protestants* themselves when they *pray* others to *pray* for them, use it in a quite different sense, than when they *pray* to *God:* for as applyed to *God*, it imports a *total dependance* upon him, as the *Author* of all good; but as apply'd to *Just* and *Holy men*, it implies no more, than a *Communion* of *Love* and *Society* in the Members of the *Church Militant*, with those of the *Triumphant*, for the assistance of their *Prayers*, to *him*, who only can give what we ask. And in this sense the words *Prayer, Invocation*, &c. are used by *Catholicks*, when they are applyed to the *Holy Angels* and *Saints*. And that *Origen*, when he denies *that our Prayers are to be offered to any but Christ alone*, speaks of *Prayer* in the *first* sense, and not in the *latter*, is evident from what he had said before in the beginning of the first Book, where he acknowledges that the *Angels do offer up the Prayers of Men to God*, (and surely it can never

never be *Idolatry* in us to *desire* them to *do* what they *do*; and much more from his own practice, in his *first Homily* upon *Ezechiel*, where he *Invocates* an *Angel* in these words, *Come Holy Angel, and receive Him who is converted from his former Errour.* And therfore, when he says, *We are not to pray to them who pray for us*; He adds, (as the Doctor cites him p. 149.) *That we ought not to divide our supplications between God and them*; By which he explains himself to mean, that we ought not to *pray* to *them* in the *same manner*, as we do to *God*; for that indeed were *to divide our supplications*; But to desire them to *offer* up our *Prayers*, or to *pray* for us, is not *to divide our supplications between God and them*, but to *unite their Prayers* to ours, as we do the Prayers of *just* Men upon Earth, whom we desire to *pray* for us. It is evident then, and mostly out of the very places cited by the Doctor himself, that the *Invocation* or *Honour*, which *Origen* denies to be given to *Angels*, is *that* which is due to *God*.

§. 4. But now the Doctor, weary (it seems) of being serious so long to no purpose, thought fit to entertain his Reader with an other Essay (for one *Enterlude* of this kind we have had already in the 1*st*. Chap.) of the peculiar Faculty he hath in exposing the Saints to derision. *Celsus* (saith he, p. 150)

yet

yet further urges, that according to the doctrin of the Ægyptians, every part of a Man hath a particular Dæmon or Ethereal God, and every one of these being invocated, heals the diseases of the parts proper to themselves; why then may they not justly be invocated? saith Celsus. And if one of the Church of Rome, saith Dr. Still. had been to answer him, he must have told him, that the thing was rational which he said, only they were out in their Names; for instead of Chnumen, Chnaachumen, Cnat, Sicat, Biu, Eru, &c. They should have chosen Raphael for travelling and against Diseases, Apollonia against the Tooth-ach; Sebastian and Roch against the Plague, St. Nicholas against Tempests, Michael and St. George against Enemies, and others in like cases. Thus the Doctor makes sport for himself, and others of his humour, by deriding a practice used by some Catholick People, of addressing themselves to some particular *Saints*, rather than others, against particular dangers or diseases; as if there were no difference between the *Ægyptians dæmons*, or *Ethereal Gods*, and the *Saints*, but in the *Names*: or between the *Ægyptians* addresses to those *Devils*, and those of *Catholicks* to the Holy *Saints* and *Angels*, but in the *language*; and that there needed no more, but to correct the *Names*, as you would do faults escaped in Printing, viz. for *Chnumen* to read *Raphael*; for *Chnaachumen*, *Apollonia*;

Apollonia; for *Cnat*, *Sebaſtian*; for *Sicat*, *Roch*; for *Biu*, *Michael*; and I ſuppoſe for, *&c.* (it is ſo like the *Dragon's* Tail) St. *George*, who otherwiſe muſt be left out. But the *ſport* is not more *pleaſing* to thoſe who *mock* at all *Religion*, than I ſhall make it appear *ridiculous* to all *ſober Readers*, by ſhowing Two things: 1. The difference between the Doctrine and Practice of the *Ægyptians*, and that of *Catholicks*. 2. The reaſonableneſs of the practice of making addreſſes to one particular *Saint*, rather than another.

Firſt then, That *Catholicks* look upon the *Saints* with a different regard from what the *Ægyptians* did their *Dæmons*, is evident, in that the *Ægyptians* believed *them* to be *Gods*, which is far from the heart of any *Catholick* to believe of the *Angels* and *Saints*: And it is no leſs evident that the addreſſes they make to them are *different* from thoſe the *Ægyptians* made to thoſe *Gods*, becauſe as *Origen* ſaith, the *Invocation* which *Celſus* contended for, was *Votiva illis ſacrificia reddere, to offer ſacrifice to them*, (which is due to *God* alone) and that upon account that they had power to heal the *Diſeaſes* of the *Parts* proper to themſelves: But the *Invocation* which *Catholicks* make to the *Holy Angels* and *Saints*, is but to deſire them, as we do Holy Men upon Earth, to pray for us. And there-

therefore when the Doctor ſaith, that *If one of the Church of Rome had been to Anſwer Celſus, he muſt have told him, that the thing was Rational which he ſaid.* I muſt tell him, that what he ſaith is *Irrational* and *falſe*, becauſe both the *Conceit* they have of the *Angels* and *Saints*, and the *addreſſes* they make to them, as I have ſhewed, are point blank *oppoſite* to thoſe of the *Ægyptians*. But now on the other ſide, ſuppoſing the *Ægyptians* had the ſame *conceit* of their *Dæmons*, which *Catholicks* have of the *Holy Angels* and *Saints*, and that they did no more but as *Catholicks* do, deſire them to pray for them to the *ſupream God*; would it follow that *Catholicks* may not deſire the Prayers of the *Saints* and *Angels?* No more, than becauſe the *Ægyptians* erected *Temples*, and offred *Sacrifice* to their *great God Oſiris*; therefore *Catholicks* may not do the *ſame* to the very *true God* himſelf: or, becauſe *they* made their *ſolemn ſupplications* to a *falſe God*; therefore *Proteſtants* may not offer up their *Prayers* to the true *One*.

2. The reaſonableneſs of making addreſſes to one particular *Saint* rather than another in ſome particular occaſions: And this will appear from the Conſideration upon which it is uſually done, which is not a diviſion of *Offices* among the *Saints*, every one of whom may equally intercede without en-

trenching

trenching upon the Propriety of another, and their *Interceſſion* may be implored by us, in all *kinds* of neceſſities whatſoever; but it is grounded upon a *Reflexion*, which the ſuppliant makes either upon ſome ſignal *Grace*, which ſhined in that *Saint* above others, as *Patience*, *Humility*, *Chaſtity*, &c. (for which reaſon the *Church* ſaith of every one of them, *Non eſt inventus ſimilis illi*, *that there was no other found like to him*) or upon the particular *manner* of his *ſuffering Martyrdom*, or ſome particular *Miracle*, or ſuch like *remarkable* paſſage in his Life and actions; which may ſerve to excite the *Hope* of the ſuppliant to obtain redreſs by means of his Interceſſion, in a caſe which he conceives to bear a ſuitableneſs or conformity to ſomething acted or ſuffered by him. Now the efficacy of *Prayer* being grounded on *Hope*, and it being natural to us to *hope* for redreſs where *others* have found it, or where it may more reaſonably be expected, by reaſon of ſome particular qualification we apprehend in the Perſon to whom we addreſs, it is manifeſt, that as the aboveſaid *Reflexion* ſerves to erect our *Hope*, ſo alſo it conduces to the end of *Prayer*, that is, the *obtaining* of what we pray for. Hence it is, that although all the *divine* Attributes are *really one* and the *ſame indiviſible Perfection* in *God*, yet for *pardon* we fly to his *Mercy*; for *knowledge* to his *Wiſdom*,

Wiſdome, for *Protection* to his *Power*, &c. And St. *Paul* aſſigns the *remiſſion* of our *ſins* to the *Paſſion* of *Chriſt*, but our *Juſtification* (by which we riſe to *newneſs* of *life*) to his *Reſurrection*. *He was delivered to death for our ſins, and roſe again for our Juſtification.*

Rom. 4. 25.

The reaſon whereof he gives in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, c. 2. v. 18. Where he ſaith, that *it behoved Chriſt to be made like unto his Brethren in all things, that he might be a merciful and faithful High-Prieſt in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the ſins of the People*; *For*, ſaith he, *in that he ſuffred himſelf being tempted, he is able to ſuccour them that are tempted*; that is, by what he ſuffred himſelf, he is made *prompt* and *ready* to ſuccour thoſe who are in *affliction* and *Temptation*. For it was true even of his moſt *ſacred Humanity*, what the *Poet* out of the very nature of *Humanity* made another ſay, *Haud ignara mali, miſeris ſuccurrere diſco*, that by his own ſufferings he had learnt how to compaſſionate the *ſufferings* of others. And *this* was laid down by St. *Paul*, as a powerful Argument to perſwade the *Hebrews* to put their Hope in *Him* for their reconciliation with *God*, becauſe he was ſo particularly *qualified* and *fitted* for that Work by what he had ſuffered. Why then may not a like Conſideration of the fitneſs or qualification

fication of *one Saint* above others, as ſo conceived by us, (either for his *eminent* Perfection in ſuch a particular *virtue*, or ſome other *Remarkable* paſſage in his Life) be taken as a *Motive* to invite us to addreſs for the obtaining what we ſtand in need of, to *his Interceſſion* before others? The Scripture we know to perſwade us to *Patience* in *Adverſity*, bids us reflect upon the *ſufferance* of *Job*; And why may not his *eminence* in that virtue, as it ſerves for an *example* of our Imitation, be alſo taken as a particular *motive* of our having recourſe to his *Interceſſion*? And when *Jacob* bleſſed the two *Sons* of *Joſeph*, *Ephraim* and *Manaſſes*, among ſo many *Angels* whoſe aſſiſtance he might have implored, he beggs for that *Angel* in particular to be their *Guardian*, who had delivered him out of all his troubles. *The Angel*, ſaith he, *who delivered me from all evils, bleſs theſe Children*. And why? but becauſe he thought that *he* who had been ſo careful to deliver *him*, would be as careful to deliver *them*. And upon this account were I in danger of being ſhip wrackt, I ſhould ſooner fly to the Interceſſion of St. *Paul*, who had ſaved by his Prayers all his Fellow-paſſengers in the Ship from being drowned, than to *another* who had never been in the like danger. *James* 5. 10. Gen. 48. 16.

danger. Behold here then the *Crime* of *Catholicks* in calling particularly upon the *Angel Raphael when they travel*, because he protected young *Tobias* in his Journey; upon *St. Roch against the Plague*, because his *Charity* was signal in assisting those who were infected with it: upon *St. Nicholas against Tempests*, because he saved some by his Prayers, who in a storm at Sea invoked him, while yet alive: upon *St. Apollonia for the Tooth-ach*, because all her Teeth were stricken out for her free Confession of *Christ*; and upon St. *Michael* and St. *George* against *Enemies*, because the latter was by *Profession* a *Souldier*, and a most valiant *Martyr*. And the *former* is recorded in Scripture to be the *Protector of the People of God.*

Dan. 10. 21. & 12. 1. This is the *Crime* for which the Doctor charges *Catholicks* with *Idolatry*. But if it be a *Crime* in them, it is much like that of a *Beggar*, who *hopes* to find *relief* at that *door*, where he hears others have been *relieved* before. The Doctor perhaps to carry on his *sport*, will instance in some addresses that are made to particular *Saints* upon such accounts, which seem to him *ridiculous*, or it may be *contrary* to what happened to the *Saint*. But while I defend the *reasonableness* of the *practice* in it self, I am not bound to defend, that *all* who use it, take the *hints* of their

their application to one *Saint* before another from *ſolid* and *reaſonable* Motives. This I know, that what ſeems *ridiculous* to One who ſcoffs at *devotion*, may ſerve to raiſe affections in another who is *truly devout*: And the *Chananean* Woman, when *our Saviour* ſaid to her, *It is not good to take the Children's bread and caſt it to Dogs*, Matth. 15. 26. drew an *Argument* of *Hope*, from whence another who had not *her Faith* would have taken a *Motive* of *deſpair*. In fine, to conclude this Point, let us ſuppoſe that *Martha* and *Mary Magdalen*, who are now *glorious Saints* in Heaven, were again living upon Earth, I would gladly know whether a Perſon guilty of *Incontinency*, might not without being guilty alſo of *Ægyptian Idolatry*, conceive a greater *Hope* of obtaining God's favour by the Prayers of ſo *Exemplar* a *Convert*, than by thoſe of her *Siſter*, though more *Innocent*? Surely the Parallel *Example* of her *Converſion*, and the particular Zeal ſhe muſt have for the *Converſion* of others, would ſoon determin the devotion of the *Penitent* to have recourſe to *her* Interceſſion? The Caſe is the ſame now ſhe is in *Heaven*, for ſhe hath not loſt her *Charity* by being there. And the caſe is the ſame in addreſſes made to other *Saints*, upon like accounts, as I ſhewed above. When therefore the Doctor

hath a mind hereafter to change the names of the *Ægyptian Gods*, who according to their doctrin presided over the several parts of Man; let him, if he please, transcribe out of the *Almanack* the *Anatomy of Mans Body, as the parts thereof are govern'd by the Twelve Signs, Aries, Taurus, Gemini, Cancer, Leo, &c.* The *Characters* at least may stand indifferently, as *Hieroglyphical* Notes either of the *Signs* of the *Zodiack*, or *Ægyptian Deities*. But nothing can be more ridiculous, than to assert, that there is *no disparity* between the *Ægyptians worship* of those *Deities*, and the *honour* which *Catholicks* give to the *Saints*, but in the *Names*. Thus much for *Origen*.

§. 5. His *second* Testimony is out of the Commentaries, under the Name of St. *Ambrose*, where that Authour speaking against *those who neglecting the true God, said it was sufficient for them to worship only the things which are seen*, says, that *they made use of a miserable excuse, which was, that access might be made to God by these, as we go to the King by his Courtiers*, &c.

In Ep. ad Rom. c. 1.

To this I answer, that it is evident by the Answer of that Author, as set down by the Doctor, that he speaks of *those who gave the honour due to God, to a Creature, and forsaking God, adored their Fellow servants*. Whom therefore

therefore he compares to *those who give the honour due to the King, to any of his Courtiers*, which as *he* doth not, who only makes use of a *Courtier* to *recommend* him to the *King*: so neither do *Catholicks* give the *honour* due to *God*, to the *Saints*, who only require the favour of their *Prayers* to *God*. But here the Doctor makes a terrible blunder by his dextrous translating those words of the Author, [*Suffragatore non opus est, sed mente devota:*] To signify, that *because nothing is hid from God, therefore we need no one to recommend us to his favour; a devout mind is enough*: which if it were the *Author*'s meaning (as it is the Doctor's) would make him to *exclude* not only the necessity we have of the *Prayers* of our *Fellow-members*, as well of the *Church Militant* as *Triumphant*, but also of the *Intercession* of *Christ* himself: for, if *a devout mind be enough*, and that *we need no one to recommend us to God's favour*, what need we the *Prayers* of others, or the *Intercession* of *Christ*? But it is manifest, that the Author takes not the *word* in *this sense*; but as those are called *suffragatores*, whose *vote* or *advice* the *King* takes (for example) in the *Election* of his *Officers*, because as the Author there addeth, *being but a Man, he knows not of himself whom to employ in publick affairs*, without being inform'd by others. This is the *Reason* given by the *Author*, and this is what the

Heathens affirm'd of their *Inferiour Deities*, as St. *Austin* reports, Viz. *That the Ethereal Gods who have care of humane affairs, would not know what Men do, unless the Aerial Dæmons declared it to them.* By which it appears, that when the Author says, *Suffragatore non eſt opus*, that *because nothing is hid from God, there is no need of a ſuffragator*, he means, that *GOD* needs not any one to *inform* or *adviſe* him what to do, as *Kings* do, and as the *Ethereal Gods* of the *Heathen* did; but not, according to Dr. *St.*'s Verſion, that we *need no one to recommend us to his favour*, that is, that *we* need not the *Prayers* and *Interceſſions* of *juſt Perſons*, which the *Scripture* ſaith, *are available with Him.*

De Civ. Dei. li. 8. c. 21.

§. 6. The like Piece of *Legerdemain* he uſes in his next Teſtimony (*p.* 153.) out of St. *Auſtin*, for where he ſaith, that if *the Ethereal Gods can ſee our minds* [*non ad hoc dæmonibus indigent nuncii*] *they need not for this the dæmons for Meſſengers or Informers.* The Doctor tranſlates it *perſonally*, that *if our minds can be known without their help, there is no need of their Mediation*, intimating thereby, that if our *neceſſities and prayers* can be known to *God* without his being inform'd by the *Holy Angels* and

De Civ. Dei. li. 8. c. 21.

and *Saints*, we need not their *Prayers* and *Intercession* to recommend us to his favour. These are the shifts the Doctor is put upon, to wrest the *Fathers* to say what they never mean't. But now he thinks he hath knockt us on the Head with a down-right blow, when he tells us out of the same St. *Austin*, that *those who are Christians do believe, that we need not many, but One Mediator, and Him the very Person himself, by whose participation we are made happy.* But here also his *Pen* (that *fatal Instrument* by which he does us *dead*) moved not so *even*, as not to slant a little from the true translation and meaning of St. *Austin's* words. For whereas St. *Austin* disputing there against the *Platonists*, who made the *Inferiour Deities* to be *Mediatours*, said, *Non multis sed uno Mediatore opus erat*, that *to bring us to happiness, there needed not many, but One Mediator*; the Doctor first makes a *Preface* of his own, as if it were St. *Austin's*, that *those who are Christians do believe*; And then turns [*opus erat, there was no need*] (as *Plato* pretended) into *we need not many, but One Mediator*; as if St. *Austin* were disputing against Catholicks for desiring the *Intercession* of the *Saints*. To the Testimony it self, as it stands translated by the Doctor, I answer, that it is plain from the very words of St. *Austin*, that he speaks *lib.9 c.15.*

of ſuch a *Mediator*, *by whoſe Participation we are made happy*, that is, of a *Mediator* of *Redemption*, and not a *Mediator* of *Interceſſion*, that is, ſuch an one as may recommend us in his Prayers, to obtain God's favour *through his Son Jeſus Chriſt our only Saviour and Redeemer*: for theſe may be *many*, as Mr. *Thorndike* well obſerves, when he ſaith, that *if whoſoever be accepted to pray for another, is neceſſarily by ſo doing his Mediator, Interceſſor or Advocate to him, with whom he is admitted to deal on his behalf by his Prayers, then — Certainly neither could Job intercede for his friends, nor Samuel for the Iſraelites, nor Abraham for Abimelech or Pharaoh, nor any of God's Prophets for any that had or were to have recourſe to them for that purpoſe, but they muſt be by ſo doing Mediators, Interceſſors and Advocates for them with God.* And in this ſenſe, (ſuppoſing that the *Saints pray for us*, which Dr. *St.* ſaith, *he will not deny the Fathers did believe*. p. 173.) He admits that the *Saints* may be called *our Mediators*, and *Interceſſors* to *God*, and that *to diſpute whether they may be counted ſo or no, is a meer contention about words*. Now that the word *Mediator* is not ſo appropriated to *Chriſt*, but that it may be and is applyed to ſome other, even in Holy Scripture, the *Annotations* ſet forth upon the

Epil. 3. *Part.* p. 355.

Bible in 4° *London*, 1610.

the *Bible* by *Publick Authority* tell us, when explicating that place of St. *Paul*, *Gal.* 3. 19. [*The Law was ordained by Angels in the hand of a Mediator*] They affirm that the *Mediator* there meant was *Moſes*. But however the *word Mediator* may be uſed, the Doctor ſays, *it would be ridiculous here to diſtinguiſh Mediators* of *Redemption* and *Interceſſion*, *becauſe* all *that the Heathens attributed to their good ſpirits*, (for ſo *he* will have them to be in deſpite of St. *Auſtin*, who calls them *Devils*) *was only Interceſſion*.

This he avoucheth here in the face of the World, *p.* 156. but (as I ſuppoſe) in confidence, that neither his *Reader*, nor his Adverſary will be ſo rude, as to remember him of what he told us out of *Celſus*, p. 150. that the *Ægyptian Deities* at leaſt, I mean *Chnumen*, *Chnaachumen*, *Cnat*, *Sicat*, *Biu*, *Eru*, &c. *Every one of them healed the diſeaſes of the parts proper to themſelves*, *and therefore might juſtly be invocated*; not yet of what he told us ſo lately out of St. *Auſtin*, p. 155. that *the Heathens ſuppoſed that the Gods could not know the Neceſſities and Prayers of Men*, *but by the Intervention of thoſe Spirits*, *and that the giving them divine worſhip proceeded upon that ſuppoſition*; *Viz.* that it was their *Office* to inform the Superiour *Gods* of what they could not know otherwiſe. For, if theſe things be *true*, it is ma-

nifeſtly *falſe* what the Doctor affirms at preſent: *Viz.* that A L L *that the Heathens attributed to their Inferiour Deities was only Interceſſion*; and conſequently, he not only *contradicts* the *Truth*, but (what perhaps to him is worſe,) *Himſelf* alſo. So *dear* doth it coſt him, to make the *Church* of *Rome* appear guilty of *Idolatry*, for deſiring the *prayers* of the *Holy Angels* and *Saints*; not to *inform* God of what he knows not, nor for them to *give* what they ask, (as the *Heathens* believed of their *Deities*) but only to *recommend* us to his favour, as we begg the *prayers* of one another. But his *Zeal* is not all ſpent. There follows a *ſecond Part* of it to the ſame doleful *Tune*; And we muſt dance *ſtep by ſtep* after it, if we will not be counted *Rats*.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

What kind of Worſhip of Angels was Condemned by St. Paul, Theodoret, *&c. with a farther diſplay of the diſparity between the Heathens Worſhip of their Inferiour Deities and that given by Catholicks to Holy Angels and Saints.*

§. 1. THe *Second Thing* the *Doctor* propoſed to ſhow out of the *Fathers*, (p. 154.) was, that *they did not only condemn giving this worſhip to the Spirits, which the Heathen worſhipped, but to good Angels too.* And here again he deludes his Reader with that *general* term of *this Worſhip*; as if the honour which *Catholicks* give to the *good Angels*, by deſiring their *Prayers* to the *only true God*, were the ſame with *that worſhip* which the *Heathen* gave to *thoſe ſpirits whom they worſhipped* with *ſacrifice* as *Gods*. But we muſt give him leave to cry *whoop, all hid*, in Generals, and find him out if we can.

The firſt place he ſeeks to *hide* himſelf in, (and he was ſo afraid to be diſcover'd, that he would not ſet down the words) is that Text of St. *Paul*, Col. 2. 18. *Let no Man beguile*

beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility, and worſhipping of Angels, &c. and not holding the Head (Chriſt.) Here he ſaith, that St. *Paul doth in the general condemn the worſhip of Angels*, that is, *all* kind of *worſhip* of any kind of *Angels*, whether good or bad. But if ſo, why did St. *Paul* ſay, in a *voluntary humility*, and *not holding the Head* Chriſt? Theſe Clauſes ſufficiently intimate a particularity in the Worſhip, which St. *Paul* condemn'd, and *this was*, ſaith St. *Chryſoſtome*, *that ſome among the Coloſſians ſaid that we ought to be reconciled, and have acceſs to the Father, not by Chriſt, but by the Angels.* And *this*, ſaith he, *is that which is ſaid* (*i.e.* condemned) *by the Apoſtle*, that they ſo admitted and worſhipped the *Angels* for *Mediators*, as to *exclude Chriſt*: And the reaſon why they did ſo, is given by *Theophylact*, becauſe *they eſteemed it a thing unworthy the Majeſty of the only begotten Son*, on the one ſide, to make the Reconciliation, *and far tranſcending Man's Poverty or lowneſs* on the other. This ſuppoſed, the *Doctor*'s petty Objections of St. *Paul's not diſtinguiſhing good Angels* from *evil* ones, and *our ſetting up other Mediatours beſides Chriſt*, vaniſh into Air, becauſe *good Angels* themſelves are not to be worſhipped, but

S. *Chryſoſt.* in *Col.* 2. 18.

Theophyl. in *Col.* 2. 18.

in

in ſubordination to *Chriſt* the *Head*, nor their Prayers to be deſired as efficacious for us, but through *his merits*. And when we have recourſe to them upon *this account*, it is no more to ſet up *other Mediators beſides Chriſt*, than when we deſire the Prayers of *Holy Men* upon Earth.

§. 2. But *Theodoret* upon this Place of the *Apoſtle*, ſaith, *that thoſe who defended the Law, perſwaded Men to worſhip Angels, becauſe the Law was delivered by Angels*; *which practice*, he ſaith, *continued a long time in Phrygia and Piſidia*; *and therefore the Synod of Laodicea doth forbid praying to Angels*; *And to this day the Oratories of St. Michael are among them. This they perſwaded Men to, as a piece of humility, affirming that God the Creator of all things could not be ſeen nor comprehended, nor approached by us*; *and therefore we ought to obtain his favour by the Angels.* This is what *Theodoret* ſaith, and the Import of it amounting only to this, that St. *Paul* and the *Council* of *Laodicea* (in his Judgment) forbad the worſhipping or praying to *Angels*, upon account that the *Law was deliver'd by them* (and therefore, as *Theophylact* ſaith, *they brought us ſalvation*) or that God by reaſon that he is *Inviſible* and *Incomprehenſible*, *cannot be approached, but by the Angels*: The Reader ſees how unjuſtly this Place is urged againſt *Catholicks*, who have recourſe

recourſe to the *Holy Angels* for their Prayers, not upon account that they *brought us ſalvation without Chriſt by delivering the Law*, or that *God* is ſo high we cannot have *acceſs* to Him, but by *them:* but that they, as true *Friends* of *GOD*, would intercede for us through the *Merits* of *Chriſt* our only Saviour and Redeemer: as the *Council* of *Trent* declareth.

But if *Theodoret* will not do the *Doctor's* work, *Baronius* ſhall. *No wonder*, ſaith he, (p. 155.) *Baronius is ſo much diſpleas'd with Theodoret for this Interpretation, for he very fairly tells us, what he condemns,* (and St. *Paul* too) *was the practice of the Church of Rome, and thoſe Oratories were ſet up by Catholicks, and not by Hereticks.* And I ſhall wonder more, if he find any one who will believe him; that ſo great a Champion of the *Church* of *Rome*, as *Baronius*, ſhould be ſo *ſtupid*, as to maintain in the face of the World the lawfulneſs of praying to *Angels*, as it is practiſed in that *Church*, and yet confeſs that as ſo practiſed, it is condemned by *Theodoret* and St. *Paul* too. Either *Baronius* was a very *great Dolt*, or the Doctor does not deal *very fairly* by him. And this is but too too evident: 1. Becauſe the words as put by him for the words of *Baronius*, Viz. [*what Theodoret*

Baron. An. 60. 20. 21.

doret condemns (and St. *Paul* too) *was the practiſe of the Roman Church*] are not *Baronius* his words, but the *Doctor's*, for *Baronius* ſaith there expreſly, that *Theodoret* as to the *Doctrine* of the *Veneration* of *Angels*, *recta ſenſit*, that is, held the ſame which the *Roman* Church holds at this day. 2*dly*, Becauſe the Point in which *Baronius* differs from *Theodoret*, is not that thoſe were not condemn'd by *him* and St. *Paul* too, who worſhipped Angels upon the erroneous account aforeſaid, *viz.* That *Acceſs could only be made to God by the Angels*: (whether the Authors of that Doctrine were *Jews*, or *Hereticks*, or *Philoſophers*;) but that *Baronius* judged *Theodoret* miſtaken in aſſerting the *Authors* of that Doctrine not to have been the *Heathen Philoſophers*, but certain *Hereticks*; and much more in ſuppoſing the *Oratories* of St. *Michael* in *Phrygia* and *Piſidia*, to have been erected by thoſe *Hereticks*; *Incaute nimis*, ſaith *Baronius*, *Too unwarily attributing to them the erecting of thoſe Oratories which had been of old inſtituted by Catholicks.* Baron. An. 60. n. 20. This is what *Baronius* ſaith, grounding himſelf upon ſome ancient *Records*; And here lieth the depth of the Charge, that becauſe *Theodoret* condemns the *worſhip* and *Invocation* of *Angels*, as he thought it was practis'd by thoſe *Hereticks*

in

in thoſe *Oratories* of St. *Michael*; and *Baronius* thinks him miſtaken in the matter of *Fact*, and that thoſe *Oratories* were indeed erected by *Catholicks*, therefore *Baronius* (ſaith the Doctor) *very fairly tells us, that what Theodoret condemns was the practice of the Roman Church.* Which is juſt, as if the Doctor being to comment that *Joſ.* 22. paſſage of *Scripture*, where the Children of *Iſrael* deſign'd War upon the *Reubenites*, &c. for erecting an *Altar* beſide the *Altar* of the *Lord*, ſhould tell us, that *they too unwarily aſcribed to a ſchiſmatical worſhip, what was intended for a teſtimony of the true and lawful worſhip of God.* And another Author paſſing his judgment upon this Comment of the *Doctor's* ſhould affirm, that *Dr.* St. *very fairly tells Us, that what the Iſraelites condemned in the Reubenites, was the worſhip of the true God.* Would not this be a *fair tale*, if well told by a credible Perſon of Dr. *St.*? If he would not own it for *ſuch* himſelf; Why does he impoſe ſo *foul* a one upon *Baronius*? For as the *Iſraelites* were miſtaken in the *End*, for which that *Altar* was Erected, ſo was *Theodoret*, ſaith *Baronius*, in the *uſe* of thoſe *Oratories* of St. *Michael*; and therefore it follows no more in his Judgment, that what *Theodoret* condemn'd was the true and lawful *Invocation* of *Angels*, as practis'd in the

Church

Church of *Rome*, than that *what the Iſraelites condemn'd* was the *worſhip* of the true *God*, as exercis'd among them.

§. 3. But the *Doctor* ſaith yet further, that *Baronius very fairly tells Us, that not only what Theodoret condemn'd, but what St. Paul too* condemn'd, *was the practiſe of the Church of Rome.* But this is yet *fouler* than the former; for himſelf (p. 156.) tells us, that what *Baronius contended*, was condemned by St. *Paul*, was the *Idolatry of the Heathens.* And although Dr. *St.* will needs make the *Catholick Invocation of Angels*, and the *Heathens* worſhip of *their Damons* to be the ſame, yet a greater Authority than *His* is requiſite to make us believe that *Baronius* thought ſo too. Theſe are pitiful ſleights of *ſophiſtry*, to delude an unwary Reader: And ſo are, his citing of *Irenaus*, as denying *any Invocation of Angels to be in uſe among Chriſtians*; and of the *Council* of *Laodicea*, as charging *all who worſhip Angels with Idolatry in ſo doing*: For *Irenaus* ſpeaks only of ſuch *ſuperſtitious Invocating* of *Angels*, as was uſed by the *Marcites* and *Carpocratians* in their *Magical Operations*, and working of *falſe Miracles.* And whatever Practice that were of nominating *Adverſ. Hæreſ.* li. 2. c. 57. Can. 35.

nating *Angels*, which the *Council* of *Laodicea* is ſo *ſevere* againſt, (whether of the aforeſaid *Hereticks* or *Heathens*) it is manifeſt that it cannot with any ſhow of Probability be underſtood of that *worſhip* which the *Catholick Church* gives to *Holy Angels*. 1. Becauſe the Council ſpeaks of ſuch as *nominated Angels*, and made *private Aſſemblies to them*, *forſaking* (or excluding) *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, which words were conveniently omitted by the Doctor. And, 2*dly*, Becauſe the *Council* both in the *Canon* immediately foregoing: (34.) As alſo *Can.* 51. alloweth the *honouring* and celebrating the *Feaſt-days* of the *Martyrs*, which is a plain Indication that it intended not to condemn in this *Canon* the *worſhip* due to *Angels*, of whom *Theodoret* ſaith, *That they are more to be honoured than Men*; yet not as *ſecondary Gods*, but as our *Fellow-Servants* and *Miniſters* of *God*. By this the Reader may ſee, whether *we had more reaſon to fear the force of this Canon*, or *he* the *diſcovery* of what he ſo artificially *concealed*.

Li. 3. *de Angelis.*

§. 4. To his Teſtimony out of *Origen*, p. 156. I have anſwered already, that he ſpeaks of *ſuch Prayers*, as are offred only *to God*; for he both acknowledges a diſtinction between the *worſhip* due to *God* and the *Angels*,

Angels, and himself also directs his *Prayer* to an *Angel*, as I have showed above, *p.* 359. What he cites out of St. *Austin*, (de Civit. Dei. li. 10. c. 1.) is not in the least against the *Honour* or *Invocation* of *Angels*, as taught and practis'd in the *Catholick Church*. For the *Question* there in debate between Him and the *Platonists*, as it stands propos'd in the very *Argument* of the Chapter, is, *Whether the Angels will that sacrifice be offered to God alone, or also to them?* That they may be *honour'd* with that kind of worship, with which *Holy Men* or *Blessed Souls* are *honoured* by us, he sufficiently intimates in his 20*th*. Book against *Faustus*, c. 21. Where he equally denies the *worship* due to *God*, ought to be given to *any* of them.

And elsewhere, as if he intended to prevent the *Dr.*'s Objection, as to the worship of *Angels*; he saith, *Neither let it move you, that the Angel* (Apoc. 19. 10.) *forbiddeth St. John to worship Him, and admonisheth Him rather to worship God; For the Angel*, saith he, *appeared such* (that is, in so glorious a manner) *that he might* (by mistake) *be worshipped for God, and therefore the Worshipper was to be corrected.* And this he saith in reference to what he had said before, Viz. *That it is observable in the Precept* [*Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve*] *Tom.* 4. *sup. Gen.* 9. 61.

that it is not ſaid, Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God only, *as it is ſaid, Thou ſhalt ſerve Him only, which in Greek is* λατρεύσεις: by which it is plain, that in St. *Auſtin's* Judgment, although *Latria* be due to *God* alone, yet *worſhip* may be given to others. When therefore he ſaith in the place now under debate, that *the Bleſſed ſpirits are not willing we ſhould ſacra facere*, that is, *dedicate*, (the Doctor tranſlates it equivocally *to perform any ſacred Offices*) *and ſacrifice to them, or conſecrate our ſelves, or any thing of ours to them by the Rites of Religion*, it is evident he ſpeaks of the *worſhip* which is due to *God* alone, that is, of ſuch *Dedications* and *Conſecrations*, as were performed by the *Heathens* to their *Dæmons* as *Gods*. And although in his 61. *Q.* upon *Exodus*, he makes this difference (as the Doctor objecteth againſt us) between *Latria* and *Dulia*, that *Dulia is due to God, as he is Lord; but Latria is not due, but to God as he is God.* Yet in the very place cited here by the Doctor, he affirms, *that that ſervice which is given by ſervants to their Maſters, is wont to be called by another Name in Greek*, that is, *dulia*. But this the Reader was not to know, for fear he might infer, that if ſome degree of the ſervice called in Greek *dulia*, might be given by *Servants* to their *Maſters*, then ſurely

Li. 10. de Civ. Dei. c. 1.

ly a higher degree of it may be given to the *Holy Angels*.

6. 4. But now after all these endeavours used by the Doctor, to hide himself in the *General* terms, of *such worship, Religious worship, Prayer, Invocation*, &c. and some *obscure* passages of the *Fathers*; He tells us, that *he knows very well* (and I pray God, his own knowledge may not rise against him in the Day of Judgment) *by what Arts all these Testimonies are endeavoured to be evaded*, (or rather, by what *Light* he will be discovered to have said nothing to the purpose,) Viz. *That these sayings of the Fathers were intended against the Heathens Idolatry who worshipped those Spirits as Gods, and offered Sacrifices to them: But the Church of Rome denies the Angels and Saints to be Gods, and asserts that the worship by Sacrifice is proper only to God.* This Answer is indeed given by St. *Austin* very often, and others of the *Fathers*: And there needed no other, to the Testimonies he produces, if all who read his Book, knew as much as himself. *But such devices as these*, (for so he calls them, though prov'd to be the *sense* of the *Fathers* out of the very places cited by him) he saith, *can never satisfy an impartial mind.* And (to return him his own words in a like occasion) I must tell him, that *if ever he speak home to our case, he must do it upon this Point. And so he does, but*

very little to his comfort; as I ſhall make appear, by ſhowing the *nullity* of the *Reaſons*, with which he endeavours to make the aforeſaid Anſwer ſeem *inſufficient*.

1. The Firſt is, becauſe *The Fathers*, he ſaith, (p. 158.) *do expreſly deny, that Invocation or Prayer is to be made to the Angels, and Saints*. But this is but to ſay the ſame thing over again, or to equivocate (as Mr. *Thorndike* ſaith) in the terms of *Prayer* and *Invocation, which are not ſo proper to God, but that in deſpite of our hearts, they may be uſed in ſignifying requeſts made alſo to Men*.

2. His ſecond Reaſon is, becauſe *It would be no more unlawful to ſacrifice to Saints or Angels, than to Invocate them*. And this Reaſon clearly deſtroys it ſelf, becauſe it ſuppoſes we hold it *unlawful* to *ſacrifice* to the *Saints*, as the *Heathens* did to their *Inferiour Deities*. But to let that paſs with the reſt: If he take the word *Invocation* here to ſignifie the *Prayer* we make to *God*, as the *Author* and *Giver* of all Good, I grant it, no leſs *unlawful* to *ſacrifice* to *Saints* and *Angels*, than to *Invocate* them. For what *Catholick* ever taught or thought that it was lawful to *Invocate* any *Angel* or *Saint* upon that account? But if the word *Invocation* on the one ſide (as in deſpite of all oppoſition it may be, and by the *Cuſtome* of the *Church* it is uſed) be taken to ſignify the requeſts we

make

make to *Angels* and *Saints* to pray for us; and on the other ſide the offering of *ſacrifice* be not only by the cuſtome of the *Church*, but of all *Mankind* (as St. *Auſtin* teacheth) appropriated to ſignify the *abſolute worſhip* due only to God; Who ſees not the *unlawfulneſs* of offering it to any *Saint* or *Angel*, may conſiſt with the *lawfulneſs* of deſiring them to *pray* for us? The caſe is plain in *juſt Men* upon Earth. For St. *Paul* and *Barnabas* accepted willingly the *Prayers* which others made to them for their aſſiſtance, but utterly *refuſed* to admit the *ſacrifice* which the *Lycaonians* (Acts 14.) would have offered to them: and it is as plain of the *Saints* in Heaven, becauſe we *pray* no otherwiſe to them, than we do to *Holy Men* upon Earth, though more *devoutly* upon the account of their unchangeable ſtate of Bliſs. How then could the Doctor *parallel* theſe two together, and not only *parallel* them, but make it leſs unlawful to *pray* to the *Saints*, than to offer *ſacrifice* to them? I'le tell you. *Catholicks*, when they write againſt *Infidels* or *Hereticks*, make uſe of the *Anſwers* which the *Fathers* have formerly given to their Objections. But Dr. *St.* being to *oppoſe* the Doctrine of the *Catholick Church*, in the Point of Invocation of Saints, is forc't to maintain an Argument of the *De Civ. Dei.* li. 10. c. 4.

Heathens againſt St. *Auſtin*: *Nay*, ſaith he, (p. 158.) *The Heathens in* St. Auſtin *argued very well, that ſacrifices being meer external things, might more properly belong to the Infertour Deities: but the more Inviſible the Deity was, the more Inviſible the ſacrifices were to be, and the greater and better the Deity, the ſacrifice was to be ſtill proportionable.* Thus the Doctor, to ſhow *that in all reaſon the duty of Prayer ought to be reſerved as more proper to God, than any External ſacrifice*; or, as he va ies the Phraſe, than a *meer outward ſacrifice*: and conſequently that *Prayer* was leſs communicable to a *Saint*, than *Sacrifice*. But do you not think the Doctor us'd the utmoſt of his confidence here, to own and maintain for *good* (nay *very good*) an Argument of the *Heathens* confuted by St. *Auſtin* in that very place? *The Heathen*, ſaith Dr. *St. argued very well.* I deny it, ſaith St. *Auſtin*, becauſe in ſo arguing they manifeſt *that they do not know* (*neſciunt*) *that viſible ſacrifices are the ſigns of the Inviſible Sacrifices of the mind*; *like as the words we ſpeak are the ſigns of things. For as when we pray or praiſe, we direct the words to him, to whom we offer in our hearts the things themſelves, which we ſignify by them: ſo when we ſacrifice, we know that the viſible Sacrifice is to be offered to no other, but*

li. 10. de Civ. Dei. c. 19.

to

to Him whoſe Inviſible Sacrifice, we our ſelves ought to be in our hearts. And upon this account (he adds a little below) *it is, and no other, that the Devils require ſacrifice to be offered to them, becauſe they know it to be due to God alone —— endeavouring by that means to hinder acceſs to the true God; that Man may not be his ſacrifice, whilſt ſacrifice is offered to any but to him.* Thus St. *Auſtin* in Anſwer to the *Heathens* Objection and the *Doctor's*. By which it appears, 1*ſt*, That in the Judgment of St. *Auſtin*, *external ſacrifice* being the *higheſt expreſſion* of the *higheſt part* of *Prayer*, which is the *devoting* and *ſacrificing* our ſelves in our hearts to *God*, it ought of all others *to be reſerv'd as moſt proper and acceptable to him:* And *that Religion* which admits no *external* viſible *ſacrifice*, muſt needs be deficient in the moſt *ſignal part* of the *Publick* Worſhip of *God*. 2*dly*, That in the Judgment of the ſame St. *Auſtin* the *Doctor* (if he ſpeak as he thinks) *knows* no more than the *Heathens* did what the true *notion* of *external ſacrifice* is, when he takes it as *diſtinguiſh'd from Prayer. And it would ſeem*, as he ſaith, p. 159. *very ſtrange indeed that ſacrifice, ſo taken, ſhould be that Latria which is proper to God.* But it ſeems as *ſtrange* to me that *He* ſhould take it *ſo*, when himſelf confeſſeth, that *thoſe who did appropriate ſacrifice to God*, (by which it ſeems himſelf

is none of them) *did comprehend Prayer as the most ſpiritual and acceptable part of it, and that it is obſervable that ſacrifices of old were Solemn Rites of ſupplication*; unleſs he meant to make his Reader believe that *Catholicks*, when they ſpeak of *ſacrifice*, as proper to *God*, mean only the *external action, as diſtinguiſh'd from Prayer*: which as it is far from their hearts and minds to think, ſo the Doctor in applauding the Doctrine of the *Heathens*, and ſiding with them againſt St. *Auſtin*, manifeſtly ſhows that he judg'd the Argument of the *Heathens* more *rational* than St. *Auſtin*'s Anſwer.

3. His third Reaſon of diſſatisfaction is, (p.159.) becauſe *upon the ſame account that the Heathen did give divine honour to their Inferiour Deities, thoſe of the Roman Church*, he ſaith, *do ſo to Angels and Saints*. But this hath been ſufficiently refuted already in the Firſt Chapter, §. 6. And at preſent there needs no more, but to put down the *Negatives* to the Doctor's *Affirmatives*, viz. that *Catholicks do not uſe Solemn Ceremonies of making any capable of Divine Worſhip; nor ſet up the Images of the Saints or Angels for that End, nor conſecrate Temples, and erect Altars to them, or keep Feſtivals and burn Incenſe before them as Gods, or offer ſacrifice to them as the Heathens* did even to their *Inferiour Deities*. Theſe are all ſuch known Truths, both

from

from the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of *Catholicks*, that nothing but a Prodigious deal of Zeal to fix the black note of *Idolatry* upon that *Church*, from which the *English* Nation receiv'd the Faith of *Christ*, could occasion the frequent repetition of so notorious a *slander*. Nor doth the Doctor so much as offer to prove the contrary of any of these Negatives against the *Church* of *Rome*, but only the *last*, of *not offering sacrifice to the Saints and Angels*. And here he thinks he hath found something to catch at, because *Bellarmin* saith, *That the sacrifices of the Eucharist, and of Lauds and Prayers are publickly offered to God for their honour*. But is *this* what the *Fathers* say of the *Heathens* worship of their *Inferiour Deities*, that they offered *sacrifices* to *God* for *their honour*? No, they say expressly, that the *Heathens* offered *sacrifices* to *them*, and maintained that they *ought* to do so; whereas yet *Catholicks* profess it *ought not* to be done even to the *Holy Angels* and *Saints*, but only to God, though as *Bellarmin* saith, it may be offered to *God* in *honorem*, in, or (as the Doctor translates it) *for their honour*. And this is but what St. *Austin* professed, when he said, that *what is offered at the Memories of the Martyrs, is offered to God,*

Li. 1. de Sanct. beat. c. 7.

De Civ. Dei. li. 8. c. 27.

who

who made them both Men and Martyrs, and joyned them in Heavenly Honour with his Holy Angels, that by this ſolemnity, we may give thanks, ſaith he, *to the true God for their Victorie, and be excited to imitate what they did and ſuffered.* But the Doctor ſaith, *p.* 116. that to *ſacrifice to one for the honour of another, is a thing beyond his reach, if that ſacrifice does not belong to him for whoſe honour it is offered.* I have heard that ſome Beggars have the skill to ſhrink up their *Armes* into their Sleeves, as if they could not *reach* above a *ſpan* from their ſhoulders; And now I perceive there is an *Art* of ſhrinking up *Underſtandings*, as well as *Armes*. For who can believe it beyond Dr. *St.*'s reach to underſtand how *ſacrifice* may be offered to *God* in honour, or for the *honour* of the *B. Virgin*, but that it muſt be offered to the B. Virgin her ſelf, and that ſo, as *not to honour God by it*, as he moſt *uncharitably* and *unchriſtianly* would make his Reader believe we do? A ſudden *twitch* by the hand will ſerve to pluck out the Beggar's *arm* to its full length; and becauſe I am perſwaded a *home-example* may do as much for a ſhrunk-up Underſtanding; I muſt deſire the Doctor to reflect, whether it would not be *for his honour*, that his whole Party ſhould keep a Solemn Day of *Thankſgiving* for the Great *Wit* and burning *Zeal* with which the Lord hath endow'd

dow'd Him, to the utter confuſion of the *Popiſh Cauſe*? If *he* think this would be much for *his honour*; although the *Thanks* were given to *God*, and not to *him*; I hope it is not beyond his *reach* now to Underſtand that *ſacrifice* alſo may be offered to *God* in *thankſgiving* for the great Vertues and Prerogatives he beſtow'd upon the *B. Virgin*, although the *ſacrifice* be offered to *God* and not to *her*. In a word, *Honour* is nothing but a *Teſtimony or Proteſtation of ſome excellency*; and whether *Thanks* be given to *God*, by *words*, or by *ſacrifice*, for the Gifts and Graces he hath beſtowed on ſuch a Perſon, it is an evident *Proteſtation* of ſuch *excellency* in that Perſon, and conſequently *for his honour*, though both *words* and *ſacrifice* be directed to *God*, and not to *him*.

His 4*th*. and laſt Reaſon, [that although *Catholicks* do not call the *Saints* and *Angels Gods*, yet *they give them the Worſhip of Invocation, and the honour of ſacrifices*, which are only due to *God*] This, I ſay, is but a Repetition of the Burden of the old Song of *Julian* the *Apoſtate*, and *Fauſtus* the *Manichean*: and hath been at large refuted in the precedent diſcourſe. I ſhall only add two Teſtimonies for a farther confutation of it, as *ſung* over anew by the Doctor. The firſt is of S. *Auſtin*. *We do not*, ſaith he, *erect Temples, or ordain Prieſts,* Li. 8. de Civ. Dei. c. 27.

nor

nor make Dedications, nor offer ſacrifices to the Martyrs, becauſe not They, but their God is our God. We honour indeed their Memories, as of Holy Men of God, who fought for the Truth, even to the leſs of their Lives—— But we do not worſhip them with divine honours, as the Heathens did their Gods, nor do we offer ſacrifice to them. The ſecond is of Biſhop *Mountague*, in his Treatiſe of *Invocation* of *Saints*, p. 60. Where he telleth all, who are or will be concern'd for Truth, that the *Doctors of the Church of Rome do teach, that the Saints are no Immediate Interceſſors for Us with God, but whatſoever they obtain for Us at GOD's hands, that they do obtain by and through Chriſt. And it is* (ſaith he) *for ought I know the voice of every Romaniſt, Non ipſi ſancti, ſed eorum Deus, Dominus nobis eſt.* (that is, *Not the Saints themſelves, but their GOD is our Lord.*) *So, it muſt not be imputed which is not deſerved. Were they worſe than they are, it is a ſin, they ſay, to bely the Devil; a ſhame to charge Men with what they are not guilty of, to make the breach bigger already too wide.* Thus St. *Auſtin*, and Biſhop *Mountague*; and were they alive, they might juſtly fear, that for theſe *ſingular fancies*, or *ſuperſtitious Caprichio's*, as the Doctor calls them, they ſhould fall under his laſh of being accounted Men of *mere Charity than Judgment*.

Preface, pag. 22. 12.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Term, Formal Invocation, and the different Formes uſed in the Invocation of Saints: Some Inſtances out of the Fathers, to ſhow the like to have been uſed in their Times.

§. 1. THe Doctor having made uſe, in his Anſwer to the two Queſtions, of the equivocal term of *Formal Invocation*, to amuze his Reader, I reply'd, *I underſtood not well what He meant by Formal Invocation*, but withall I told him, that *what Catholicks underſtand by it in the preſent matter, is deſiring or praying thoſe juſt Perſons, who are in Glory in Heaven to pray for them:* To ſhew the *palpable weakneſs* (as he calls it) of this Anſwer, he ſays he will prove, that *thoſe of the Church of Rome, do allow and practice another kind of Formal Invocation from what I aſſert*; and I think he never betrayed more *palpably* the *weakneſs* of *his* own *cauſe*, than in this undertaking. Let the Reader judge.

§. 2. Firſt then, he ſays, that *Never any Perſon before me imagin'd that to be the ſenſe of Formal Invocation, which I do*, when I ſay, that

that what we underſtand by it, is *deſiring or praying the Saints to pray for us.* And yet Himſelf in the very next words declares, that *he imagins* the very ſame ſenſe of it that I do, when he ſays, that *the term of Formal Invocation was purpoſely choſen by him to diſtinguiſh it from Rhetorical Apoſtrophes, Poetical Flouriſhes, and general wiſhes that the Saints would pray for us, and from Aſſemblies at the Monuments of the Martyrs; of all which,* he grants, *there are ſome inſtances in good Authors, Viz.* the Chief *Fathers* both of the *Greek* and *Latin* Church. For what is this, but to tell us, that he means by *Formal Invocation,* as I do, a real addreſs of our minds to the *Saints* themſelves to help us with their Prayers? 'Tis true indeed what *He* would have his Reader to underſtand by it, *is,* what he ſays *is conſtantly practis'd in the Roman Church to offer up our Prayers to Saints and Angels, to help us in our neceſſities, as well as to pray to God for us.* But what doth he ſay then to the *Forme* of *Prayer* uſed by us in the Letanies, *Holy Mary,* or *Holy Peter pray for us:* Is it only a *Rhetorical Apoſtrophe, Poetical Flouriſh,* or *genetral wiſh, that the Saints would pray for us:* Or, is it more? If it be no more, Why does he impugne what he grants was uſed by thoſe *good Authors.* If it be more, 'tis then a *part* at leaſt of *Formal Invocation,* as deſin'd by Himſelf. And if

when

when we pray them to *help our neceſſities*, the meaning be, that they ſhould do it *by their Prayers*, the whole ſenſe of *Formal Invocation* in this preſent matter, is *to deſire them to pray for us*: ſo that though *never any Perſon before me imagin'd this to be the ſenſe of it*, yet now I have the Doctor himſelf concurring with me in it. But to paſs on to the Proofs of his Aſſertion.

§. 3. *All the difficulty*, he ſays, (p. 163.) *lies in this, whether Catholicks pray to the Saints to help their neceſſities, as well as pray for them:* that is, whether beſides the uſual form of ſaying, *Holy Mary pray for us*; we do not ſometimes vary the *Phraſe*, and ſay, *Help me*, or *comfort and ſtrengthen me, O B. Virgin:* for, as for the meaning of the words, I never yet met with any *Catholick* ſo Ignorant, as not to underſtand the ſenſe to be, *to deſire* them to help us with their Prayers. Behold then here the terrible *Myſtery not to be made known to Proſelites*, ſaith the Doctor, *until they be firſt made ſafe and faſt enough! Viz.* that ſometimes they may uſe the like form of words to *God*, and the *Saints*, as a *Child* does to his *Father*, when inſtead of ſaying, *Pray Father, Pray to God to bleſs me*, he ſaith ſometimes *Bleſs me Father*. But *Catholicks* he ſaith, (p. 163.) *do this with all the ſame external ſigns of devotion, which they uſe to God Himſelf.* And can he excuſe a *Child* from

from *Idolatry*, when he *kneels* down with the ſame external ſign of devotion, which we uſe to *God*, and ſaith, *Bleſs me Father*, becauſe he ſaith it in a different ſenſe to his *Father*, than he doth to *God*; and will he not upon the ſame account be as charitable to us, when with the like external ſign of devotion, we ſay, *Bleſs me, or help me, Mother of God?* Mr. *Thorndike* in all his diſcourſes ſhows his unwillingneſs to free the *Practiſe* of the Church of *Rome* in this matter from *Idolatry*, yet convinc'd by the Evidence of Truth, he confeſſes, *that the Church of England having acknowledg'd the Church of Rome, a true Church, though corrupt, ever ſince the Reformation, he is oblig'd ſo to interpret the Prayers thereof, as to acknowledge the corruption ſo great, that the Prayers which it alloweth may be Idolatries, if they be made in that ſenſe, which they may properly ſignify; but not that they are neceſſarily Idolatries. For, if they were neceſſarily Idolatries, then were the Church of Rome neceſſarily no Church, the being of Chriſtianity preſuppoſing the worſhip of one true God. And although to confute the Heretiks, the ſtyle of Modern devotion,* he ſaith, *leaves nothing to God, which is not attributed to, and deſired of his Saints, yet it cannot be denyed, they may be the words of them, who believe that God alone can*

Epil. 3d. Part. p. 358.

give

give that which they desire. And if this cannot be denyed, where is the Doctor's either *Charity* or *Sincerity* to interpret these or the like words, *Help me Mother of God*, in the same sense they carry, when we say *Help me GOD?*

§. 4. But what do I do expecting *Charity* from Him, who makes it *superstitious Fanaticisme*, or at best but *Fanciful singularity* in others? The *excess* not of his *Judgment*, but *Zeal*, (if we must call it so) hath quite eaten up his *Charity*. And every thing he meets with, that is not down-right *Ora pro nobis*, must now be *Idolatrous* or *Blasphemous*. Nay, it is enough he *hath heard of our Ladies Psalter, a Blasphemous Book*, he saith, *never yet censured, wherein the Psalms in their highest strains of Prayer to God are applyed to the Virgin Mary*. But what, or whose Book soever that be, (which I first had news of from Himself) his only *hearing* of it, argues that it is no *publick Devotion* of the *Church*, and so not to be charg'd upon Her: And did it contain *Blasphemy* (as he saith it doth,) and were publickly known, no doubt it had been *censured* before this. But then again, as we are not to take all for *Gospel*, so neither are we to take all for *Blasphemy*, which the Doctor calls so. *Every one*, saith *Aristotle*, *judgeth as he is affected*, In his Preface.

and nothing more ſubject to different conſtruction, than *words*. They are like thoſe *Pictures* which repreſent a *Man* to one that ſtands on the right hand, and a *Beaſt* to another who ſtands on the left; or like the *Pillar* of *Cloud*, which gave *Light* to the *Iſraelites*, but was *darkneſs* to the *Ægyptians*. For Example, thoſe words of *Chriſt* to his *Apoſtles*. *You are the Light of the World*, if you ſet a *Few* on the one ſide, and Dr. *St.* on the other: The *Few* who owns *Chriſt* for no other than a *Seducer*, will call them *Blaſphemous*; but the Doctor, I hope, will not do ſo, although *Chriſt* ſay of Himſelf, that *He is the Light of the World*. And the only Reaſon he can give, is, becauſe though the *words* be the *ſame*, yet the *ſenſe* in which they are applyed to *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles, is very *different*. And poſſibly thoſe *higheſt ſtrains of Prayer to God*, which he ſaith are applyed in that *Pſalter* to the *B. Virgin*, may, if examined, be found not chargeable with *Blaſphemy*, on the like account. For, if it be not the *dead* words, but the *Intention* of the Speaker that animates them, which makes them to be *Prayer* (otherwiſe a *Parrot* which ſhould be taught to ſay, *Help me God*, would pray as well as a *Chriſtian*) it follows that as the *Intention* of the Speaker is *different*, ſo will the *Prayer* be alſo; that is, the *ſame words* ſpoken to *God* will have reſpect

to

to Him, as who alone can give what we desire; but applyed to the B. Virgin, will signifie only that we desire her *Prayers* to obtain for us of *God*, what we believe that he alone can give; and consequently no *strain* of *Prayer*, (properly so called) which is made to *GOD*, will be applyed to the B. *Virgin*.

§. 5. But now the Doctor will be so just, as not to *insist upon the Ancient* Breviaries, or *Obsolete Forms, or Private Devotions*, (among which surely the *Psalter* he speaks of may be ranked) There is *Blasphemy* and *Idolatry* enough, he thinks, *in the present Roman Breviary*, to serve his turn. The first Instance he gives, is that of the *Antiphon*, *Hail B. Virgin, Thou alone hast destroy'd all the Heresies in the World; and least this should be interpreted of doing it by her Son* (as the Church doth, when she presently addeth, *Dum virgo Deum & Hominem genuisti*, that is, *by bringing Him into the World, who was both God and Man*) *a Formal Invocation of Her*, he saith, *follows, Give me strength against thy Enemies:* to which he adds those Ejaculations in the *Hymn*, *Ave Maris Stella*. Wherein *she is intreated to loose the bonds of the guilty, to give light to the blind, and drive away our evils* (but he leaves out, *and to beg for us all good things*,) *and to shew her self to be*

Miss. Vot. de B. Mar. a Purif.

a Mother, (*or as it is*, ſaith he, *in the Maſſe-Book at Paris*, 1634. *Fure Matris Impera Redemptori*, *As thou art a Mother, Command the Redeemer.*) But then again, *leaſt the Hymn ſhould be thought only Poetical*, he ſaith, that *in the Feaſt of S. Maria ad Nives, a formal Prayer, is made to Her to help the miſerable, to ſtrengthen the weak, to comfort thoſe that mourn* (where again he leaves out, *Pray for the People, Intercede for the Clergy*, &c.) And the like forms, he ſaith, are uſed to St. *Michael, and the Angel Guardians, and to the Apoſtles.* And now, ſaith he, *is all this only praying to the Saints to pray for us?* Yes ſurely, if it be the *ſenſe* which makes the words to be *Prayer*, as I ſhewed above; and not the bare *Characters* or *Letters.* And that the *Church's ſenſe* is no other, but to *deſire* them to obtain for us of *God* the *bleſſings* expreſſed in thoſe forms, viz. *help, comfort, light*, &c. is manifeſt both from her frequent intermixing that uſual form of *Pray for us*, which the Doctor conveniently leaves out; and from her *publick Doctrin*, as ſet down in the *Council* of *Trent*, and inculcated to all the *Faithful* in their *Catechiſms.*

But what can be ſaid to thoſe words in the *Maſs-Book* at *Paris*, 1634. *Fure Matris Impera Redemptori*; *As thou art a Mother, Command thy Son?* I Anſwer, 1. That thoſe words, [*ſhew thy ſelf to be a Mother*] to which

which the Doctor makes these other of the *Mass-Book* at *Paris* correspond, are not found in any *Mass-Book* at all, that I can hear of; nor do the words cited by the Doctor, agree in their number and measure with the rest of the Verses of that *Hymn*, and consequently I have some Reason to believe him mistaken (at least) in citing that *Mass-Book*. But 2*dly*, Supposing the words, as cited by the Doctor, to be found in that *Mass-Book*, I confess they express a *vehemency* of Spirit, not unsuitable to the brisk and sudden efforts proper to that Nation; but yet they are *such* as may admit of a fair *construction*, if they meet with a Reader who is not obstinately bent to be way-ward. There are even in Scripture some expressions, which seem to carry with them as great an *excess* as this. For example, when *Jos.* 10. 12. 14. it is said that *Josue spake to our Lord*, and the *Sun* stood still, *God obeying the voice of a Man:* And when our Saviour saith of Himself, that in Heaven he will make *his Servants to sit down to Meat, and will serve them.* *Luke* 12. 37. Now, as the former of these expressions doth not signify, a *real Obedience* in *God* to the voice of *Man*, but his readiness *to do the will of those that fear him*; nor the latter, that *Christ* will really *serve* the Elect at Table, but only signifies the great *care* He

will take, that nothing ſhall be wanting to the complement of their joy and ſatisfaction. So alſo the words objected by the Doctor, [*As thou art a Mother, Command the Redeemer.*] do not ſignify, that ſhe ſhould *really command* Him, as ſhe did when he was *ſubject* to her upon Earth; but that *ſhe* would uſe that *Grace* and *Favour* on Our behalf, which She hath with Him, as a *Mother*, above all other *Saints*. And this being underſtood to be the *ſenſe* of the words, all that the Doctor can ſay, is that the Author was too *Hyperbolical* in the manner of his Expreſſion; and in this I dare affirm he will find very few *Catholicks* diſſenting from him. Nay more, I have reaſon to believe, that the *Pariſian Miſſal* of 1634. if there were any ſuch words in it, hath been ſince corrected; Otherwiſe my Adverſary would doubtleſs have cited the *Maſs-Book* of 1670. and not of 1634. And then the words he objects, ought to have been caſt among the Obſolete Forms, which he ſaid before, he ſhould not inſiſt upon.

§. 6. But now again, if we uſe the *ſame form* of words to the *B. Virgin*, and other *Saints*, as we do to *God*, as when we deſire *her to ſtrengthen the weak, to give light to the blind*, &c. *From whence*, ſaith the Doctor, *muſt the People take the ſenſe of theſe Prayers, if not from the ſignification of the words?* I Anſwer,

Anſwer, not meerly from *Lilly*'s Grammar Rules, but from the *Doctrine* of the *Church* delivered in her *Councils* and *Catechiſms*, and from the common uſe of ſuch words and expreſſions among *Chriſtians*. If a *Child* being taught by his Parents, that *God* alone can *give* what we ask, when he ſaith to his *Father*, *Bleſs me*, underſtands the meaning of the words to be, that his *Father* ſhould *pray* to *God* to *bleſs* him: then ſurely much more muſt *Catholick* People, when they pray to the *B. Virgin* to *drive away all evils*, underſtand the *ſenſe* to be, that ſhe would *pray to God to deliver them from all evil*; there being beſides the common Doctrine of *Chriſtianity*, (by which they are taught that *God* alone is the *Giver* of all good things,) ſo many *Sermons*, *Catechiſms*, and *Explications*, both by word and writing daily made in the *Catholick* Church, by *Prieſts* to the *People*, and *Parents* to their *Children* in this particular Point. Well, but *if this were all*, ſaith the Doctor, *why in all this time that thoſe Prayers have been complained of*, (*viz.* by thoſe who have *revolted* from the *Church*) *hath not their ſenſe been better expreſſed? Why have they not been expunged all this while, after that their Breviaries have been ſo often reviewed?* This I fear, if done, would not be enough to keep them from telling us, *Once upon a time there was a blaſphemous Book*; or in

the *Mass-Book*, Printed at *Paris* in such a Year, *there was*—— But why to comply with the humour of a *few Opiniators*, whom no Reason can satisfy, must *Mankind* be debarred the natural manner of expressing their affections? And why have not those scrupulous Persons all this while devised a *Dictionary*, or *Phrase-Book* to furnish us with words, and forms of speaking, which may equal our Conceptions, and express every little variation of our thoughts, and all the different tempers and emotions of the Spirit? Do we not *do* the same *action* sometimes more quick and smartly, than at others? Why then must we be tyed to use always the *same* form of *words*? Why may we not sometimes *utter* the same affection in a *more fervent* manner of expression, than at others? He that sees himself in an imminent danger, makes no long Preambles, but cries out, *Help me:* And St. *Gregory Nazianzen* records it as an act of great devotion in St. *Justina*, that to free her self from the snares of Satan, she call'd upon the *Virgin Mary* to *help and succour her*. But the *Doctor* hath now found a *Staff* to beat *Bellarmin* with, for offering to instance in *Scripture* that the *Apostles* are said to *save* Men, *Viz.* by their *Prayers*, &c. Therefore in the like sense we may

Orat. in S. Cyprian. ut supplicias ferat.

desire

deſire them to *ſave* us: And he lays on ſo hard, that he hath beat all the *brains* out of the *Cardinal*'s head at a blow. *Rom.*11.14. 1 *Cor.*9.22.

For will any Man, ſaith he, *in his Wits, ſay the Caſe is the ſame in Ordinary Speech, and in Prayer. Is it all one*, ſaith he, *for a Man to ſay, that his Staff helped him in his going, and to fall down upon his Knees, and pray to his Staff to help him?* And now I pray, who ſo proper a Man to confute *Bellarmin*, as Dr. *St.*? *Bellarmin* ſpeaks of ſuch *Inſtruments* as have both *Underſtanding* and *Will* to *help* us to Heaven by their *Prayers*; and he preſently lets drive at Him with his *Staff* for ſpeaking Non-ſenſe. Let the Reader judge whether the *Inſtrument* be more *Irrational*, or the *Uſe* he makes of it: I have long ſince obſerv'd, that whenever he makes other Men out *of their Wits*, The Reader hath reaſon to ſuſpect all is not *right* at home. But St. *Paul* doubtleſs was a *Rational* Inſtrument, and *What would He have ſaid*, ſaith the Doctor, *to one who ſhould ſay to him, I pray you pardon my ſins, and aſſiſt me with the grace of God?* I believe he would neither have condemned him of *groſs Idolatry*, nor *prodigious Folly*, as the Doctor doth, but conſidering the bitterneſs of his Soul, by the eagerneſs of his Expreſſion, would have given him the aſſiſtance of his *Prayers*, to obtain what he aimed

aimed to procure by his means of *God*.

§. 7. Having thus cleared the *ſenſe* of thoſe *Forms* of *Prayer*, we ſometimes uſe to the *B. Virgin*, and other *Saints*, to be no other than *praying to them to pray to God for us*, as I aſſerted in my Reply, and anſwered the little exceptions the Doctor made againſt it; I ſhall conclude this Point with ſome *Inſtances* of like expreſſions, either uſed or approved by the *Fathers* of the Primitive times. And firſt for the uſual form of, *Holy Mary*, or *Holy Peter pray for us*, the Inſtances are ſo numerous, that to tranſcribe them would make a Volume. Many of the *Fathers* are taxed for this practice by the *Magdeburgenſes*, and other *Proteſtant* Writers, and for this ſort of Invocation, Mr. *Thorndike* ſaith, *it is confeſſed that the Lights both of the Greek and Latin Church, Baſil, Nazianzen, Nyſſen, Ambroſe, Hierome, Auſtin, Chryſoſtom, Cyrils both, Theodoret, Fulgentius*, St. *Gregory the Great, Leo, more, or rather all after that time, have ſpoken to the Saints, and deſired their Aſſiſtance.* Nay, the Doctor himſelf (though diminute in his Confeſſion) acknowledges there are *ſome Inſtances of them in good Authors*, although he will needs have them to be but *Rhetorical Apoſtrophes*, and *Poetical Flouriſhes*, or *Wiſhes*, that the *Saints* would pray for us, *as we Engliſh-men*

Epil. part. 3. pag. 358.

liſhmen, when *we are at play*, (ſaith Mr. *Perkins*, and I wonder ſo pat an Example could eſcape the Problem. *p.* 91. Doctor) *call upon the Bowls to rubb, or to run as we would have them.* At this ſport he fancies St. *Hierome* to have been, when he cry'd to *Paul*, after her death, *Help me, O* Paul, *in my old Age with thy Prayers*; And ſo no doubt was the Emperor *Theodoſius* too, when as *Ruffinus* reporteth, *Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 2. *c.* 33. *He went to viſit the Sepulchers of the Martyrs, accompanyed with all the Clergy and People*, (it was, it ſeems, a General Day of Bowling,) *and proſtrate before their Aſhes*, (You may imagin to take ſurer aim) *implored aid by their Interceſſion*; or, (as St. *Chryſoſt.* hath it) in the ſame, or a like occaſion, Ho. 26. in 2 Cor. *beſought the Saints to be his Patrons and Advocates with GOD.* And the Doctor Himſelf brings in Saint *Auſtin*, as playing at the ſame Game, when he ſays (p. 173.) that he *wiſhes rather than praiſe*, that St. *Cyprian* would *help him with his prayers*; Confeſſing alſo, as I ſaid before, that there are *ſome Inſtances* of this pleaſant kind of Invocation to be found in good Authors. The difficulty then lies in *thoſe prayers which we make to Saints to help our Neceſſities*; But of theſe alſo there want not Inſtances in the Writings of good Authors of the Primitive times, *parallel* to thoſe which

which the Doctor objects out of the *present Roman Breviary*, and *Office of our Lady*. Do *we* ſay there, *Hail B. Virgin, Thou alone haſt deſtroyed all Hereſies in the World; Vouchſafe Holy Virgin to let me praiſe Thee?* St. *Cyril* ſaith, *By Thee, Holy Mother and Virgin, every Creature that worſhipped Idols, hath been converted to the knowledge of the Truth, Praiſe and Glory be to Thee, O Sacred Trinity. Praiſe alſo be to Thee, O Holy Mother of God —— Who can ſufficiently ſet forth thy Praiſes?* Do *we* entreat the *B. Virgin* to *help the miſerable, to ſtrengthen the weak*, &c.? St. *Gregory Nazianzen* above-cited, commends St. *Juſtina* for beſeeching the *B. Virgin* to *help* and *ſuccour* her. Do *we* deſire her to *protect us from our Enemies*, and *ſhew her ſelf to be a Mother?* St. *Gregory Niſſen*, calls upon St. *Theodorus* to *fight for his Country, as a Souldier, and to uſe that liberty of ſpeech for his Fellow-ſervants, which befits a Martyr*. Do *we* ſupplicate the *Angels to come to our help, and defend Us?* St. *Ambroſe* ſaith, that *they are to be ſupplicated for us, who are given us for our Protectors*. Laſtly, Do we deſire the *Apoſtles Jubere*, the word ſignifies to *wiſh* or *deſire*, as well as to *command*; but the Doctor

Hom. contr. Neſtor.

Orat. in Theodor. Mart.

Li. de vidius.

Doctor will have it here to *command the guilty to be looſed*: (And He might as well have tranſlated, *Jubeo te valere, I command you to farewell*) It is not ſo much, as what that devout Woman in St. *Auſtin*, ſaid to St. *Stephen*, when upon the death of her Child before Baptiſm, ſhe brought the dead Body to the ſhrine of the *B. Martyr*, and there *exalted* of him, ſaith St. *Auſtin*, to reſtore her Son to Life with theſe words, *Redde filium meum*, &c. *Give me my Son that I may behold him in the preſence of him, who crowned thee.* A thing both commended by St. *Auſtin*, as a *Teſtimony* of her great Faith; and confirmed for ſuch by *God*, in reſtoring her Son to Life, at the *Interceſſion* of the *Saint*. Thus much may ſuffice to ſhow, that whil'ſt the Doctor caſts ſo much Dirt upon the Doctrine and Practice of the *preſent Roman Church*, He makes it fly in the Faces of thoſe *great Fathers* and *Lights* of the *Primitive* Times. And *much leſs* might have ſufficed for an *Objection*, (which taken in all its parts, is as like the ſeeking for a *knot* in a *Bul-ruſh*, as ever yet I met with any) but that, as the Apoſtle ſaith, *We are Debtors both to the Wiſe, and to the Unwiſe*. Let us ſee whether the next be any better.

Serm 33 *de diverſis.*

De civ. Dei. li. 22. *c.* 8.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

The disparity assigned by Dr. St. between desiring the Saints in Heaven, and Holy Men upon Earth, to pray for Us, shown to be Insignificant.

§. 1. TO manifest farther the weakness of the *Doctor's* Argument, I added in my Reply, that *if Catholicks must be guilty of Idolatry, for desiring just Persons in Heaven to pray for them, upon the same account we must not desire the Prayers of a just Man, even in this Life, because this formal Invocation will be to make him an Inferiour Deity.* And the Doctor rejoins, p. 168. that *supposing this were all, yet this would not excuse them.* But from what? He was loath to name it, the consequence is so absurd, yet he would have his Reader believe, that *it would not excuse them from Idolatry.* And the Reason he gives is, *For their practice is very different in their Invocation of Saints, from desiring our Brethren on Earth to pray for us. And he cannot but wonder how any Men of common sense can suffer themselves to be imposed upon so easily in this matter.* But if he suppose, that what we do in *Invocating* the

the *Saints*, is no more than to *desire* them to *pray* for *us*, as we do other *Holy Men* upon Earth, How comes the one to be *Idolatry* and *not* the other? The difference, as far as I can gather from his words, consists in this, that amidst the Solemn Devotions of the Church, after we have prayed to the *Persons* of the *Holy Trinity*, to *have mercy on us*, remaining upon our Knees, we address to the *Saints*, and require the assistance of *their prayers*, saying, *Holy Peter and Paul pray for us*; and *this without being sure that they hear us*. This, together with a hint of our *setting up their Images in some higher place in the Church, and burning Incense before them*, is the whole summe of his Argument. These circumstances, he says, make the *desiring the Saints in Heaven to pray for us*, to be of *a very different nature* from desiring the same from our Brethren on Earth. And I wonder how any Men of common sense can suffer themselves to be so far imposed upon, as to believe that any thing of this, or all of it together can amount to *Idolatry*? Why we do not the same in all respects to Holy Men upon Earth, St. *Austin* gives the Reason, when he says, *that we worship the Saints in Heaven so much more devoutly, than when they were upon Earth, because more securely, after they have overcome all the dangers*

Li. 20. *contr. Faust. c.* 21.

dangers and uncertainties of this World, as alſo we praiſe them more confidently now reigning Conquerours in a more happy Life, than whilſt they were fighting in this. So that what we do more to them in Heaven, than whilſt they were upon Earth, in *praying* to and *praiſing* of them, is an expreſſion of a greater devotion to them now, (than then) upon the account of their *ſecure* injoyment of a ſtate of Bliſs, which they can never loſe. *But for that Worſhip, which is call'd Latria, for as much as it is a certain ſervice proper to the Divinity, we neither worſhip them,* (ſaith St. *Auſtin*, and all *Catholicks* with him) *nor teach them to be worſhipped, but God alone.* But to return to the Doctor.

§. 2. The firſt thing he cavils at, is our *turning* to the *Apoſtles* with the ſame *poſtures* and expreſſion of devotion, to deſire them to *pray* for *us*, after we have *invoked* the *Perſons* of the *Holy Trinity*: And where lies the *Idolatry* here, if we deſire them only, as he ſuppoſes, to pray for us? Is the deſiring a *juſt Man* to pray for us, to give him the *honour* due to *God?* Why then were *Job*'s Friends ſent to him for his *Interceſſion?* Or is it the doing it upon our Knees? Why then do *Parents* permit their *Children* to ask them *bleſſing* in that *poſture?* Or, is it the uſing that poſture in the *Church?* Are all the People then *Idolaters*, for deſiring upon their

their Knees the *Prieſt* (nay one another) to pray unto *God* for them? Theſe are ſuch pitiful trifles, that they were not worth the reciting, much leſs refuting, if (as St. *Hierom* ſaith of the like) to *recite* them were not to *refute* them. Well, *but St. Peter*, he ſaith, *who would not permit Cornelius to fall down before him, and St. Paul who rent his Garments and cryed out to the Men of Lyſtra, Why do you theſe things? would no doubt have been leſs pleaſed with this.*

And why ſo, if *Cornelius*, as St. *Hierome* thinks, intended through Error, to worſhip him with *divine* honour; and the Men of *Lyſtra*, (as St. *Luke* relates) to offer ſacrifice to St. *Paul*, as to a God? But then again, ſuppoſing the *honour* which *Cornelius* there intended, to have been only an *Inferiour* reſpect, as to a *Holy Man*, and that St. *Peter* (as St. *Chryſoſtome* thinketh) refuſed it out of *Humility*, (or as the Doctor terms it *Modeſty*) Does that hinder, but that upon *another* occaſion he might have *admitted* it, without danger to his *Modeſty*, and much more *ſecurely* now, that He is in Heaven? For my part, I believe that the Prophet *Elizeus* loſt nothing of his *Modeſty*, or *Humility*, when the *Sunamiteſs fell down*

Adverſ. vigilant. c. 2.

Hom. 21. in Act.

4 King. 4. 27.

and held Him by the Feet, and He forbad his Servant to thruſt Her away. To accept, or refuſe *due* honour is a matter belonging to *Prudence*; and as ſometimes it may be refuſed with *vain glory*, ſo at an other it may be admitted with *Humility*. What a *Caprichio* then was it to ſay, that *if we impute it only to St. Peter's Modeſty, we will not allow him to carry it to Heaven with him?* as if St. *Peter* could not, without forfeit forſooth of his *Modeſty*, have ſeen *Chriſtians* do to him, what they every Day do to one another in the *Church*.

§. 3. The Second thing he hints at, is that *we can never be ſure that the Saints do hear us*, therefore it muſt be *unlawful*, or as he would make it, *Idolatrous* to deſire them to *pray* for us. To this I anſwer firſt, that this can be *no excuſe* for him not to deſire the *Angels* to pray for him, for it is certain by many Texts of *Holy Scripture*, that they know our neceſſities and prayers, as *Dan.* 12. 1. *At that time ſhall Michael ſtand up, that great Prince, which ſtandeth for the Children of thy People.* Zech. 1. 12. *The Angel of the Lord ſaid, O Lord of Hoſts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jeruſalem, and on the Cities of Juda, againſt which thou haſt had Indignation theſe threeſcore and ten Years.* Pſal. 137. 2. *I will ſing unto thee in the ſight or preſence of the Angels.* Luc. 15. 7. *There ſhall be*

be Joy in Heaven, and V. 10. *There ſhall be Joy before the Angels of God upon one Sinner that doth Penance.* Apoc. 8. 4. *The ſmoke of the Incenſes of the Prayers of the Saints aſcended from the hand of the Angel before God.* All theſe places, and divers others do manifeſtly ſhow, that our *Prayers* and *Actions* are not unknown to the *Angels*; And whereas our Saviour himſelf ſaith, that *the Juſt in the Reſurrection ſhall be as the Angels in Heaven.* Matth. 22. 30. (the *equality* as to *knowledge*, not depending upon the *Body*) it follows by the *Analogy* of *Faith*, that our *prayers* and *concerns* are known alſo to the *Saints*, now enjoying the ſame Bleſſful *Viſion* with the *Angels*; and they no doubt rejoice as much at the *Converſion* of a Sinner, as the *Angels* do: and of *them* it is recorded alſo, Apoc. 5. 8. as well as of the *Angels*, that *they had golden Vials full of Odours, which are the prayers of Saints*, that is, of the *Faithful* upon Earth, who are here called *Saints*, as they are often in other places of *Holy Scripture* alſo. To this I might add the *Incomparable perfection* of the *knowledge* which the *Bleſſed* enjoy in *Heaven*, with many other arguments both from *Authority* and *Reaſon*, brought by *Catholick Divines* to prove this *Tenet*. But becauſe the Doctor brings nothing to prove the contrary, *viz.* that *the Saints do not hear us*, beſides his own, *Ipſe*

dixit; I ſhall not inlarge furt'er upon this Point, but give him all the fair play he can deſire, which is to ſuppoſe with him at preſent, that *the Saints do not hear our prayers.* But will it follow from thence, that it is *unlawful, or Idolatrical to deſire their Interceſſion?* I anſwer, (2*dly*,) with *Bellarmine*, and *deny* the *Conſequence.* 1. Becauſe, although *Proteſtant* Writers do cite ſome of the *Fathers*, as expreſſing themſelves doubtfully, *whether the Saints hear our prayers, or no*; yet ſuppoſing *this* to be as thoſe *Proteſtants* would have it, this was no Argument to thoſe very *Fathers*, not to call upon the *Saints* in particular to *pray* for them, as is manifeſt from their own *doctrin* and *practiſe*, by what hath been ſaid above, and from the Confeſſion of *Proteſtants* themſelves. 2. Becauſe it is *certain* by many and great *Miracles* wrought by *God* upon Addreſſes made to the *Saints*, that *thoſe* who call upon them are *heard*, and *obtain* what they *deſire.* And for the *Proteſtant* Reader's ſatisfaction in this Point, I ſhall ſet down ſome of them, as they ſtand recorded in the Works of St. *Baſil*, *Theodoret*, and St. *Auſtin*, witneſſes of too great *Authority* and *Integrity* to be queſtion'd, much leſs rejected, as Writers of *Fables* or *Romances.*

De Sanct. Beat. li. 1. c. 20.

1. St. *Baſil*, in his *Homily* upon the 40. *Martyrs*,

Martyrs, after he had told his Auditors that there was *Help prepared for Christians*, Viz. *The Church of the Martyrs, and that those who had taken pains to find one to pray for them, had here no less than Forty: and that it was the practise of Christians at that time for those who were in Tribulation, or Joy, to fly, and have recourse to the Forty Martyrs; those for deliverance from their Troubles, and these for the Conservation of their Prosperity:* he adds, *Here a Pious Mother praying for her Children, is accepted or heard; as also asking a saf. return for her Husband, when in a Journey; or health for him in sickness. Let us therefore pour forth our Prayers with these Holy Martyrs.* The Doctor will be apt to catch at these last words, as if St. *Basil* meant, that *Christians* were only to *join* their *prayers* with the *Prayers* of the *Martyrs*, and not to *desire* them to *pray* for them; But this exception is excluded, by what he said before, that *those who are in Affliction, fly, and have recourse to the Martyrs themselves:* which practise of the People, saith Dr. *Forbes*, the *first Bishop* of *Edinburgh*, had not St. *Basil approved*, he would never have *proposed* as an *Example* to be *imitated:* and with him agrees *Vossius* there cited by him.

Cons. Modest. c. 3. p. 311.

2*dly*, *Theodoret* is yet more expres in this

matter, Li. 8. *de Grac. Affect.* 'The Temples of the *Martyrs*, saith he, are conspicuous, and Illustrious both for their Greatness and Beauty. Nor do we frequent them only once, or twice, or five times in a year; but we celebrate frequent Assemblies in them; and often sing praises every Day to the *Lord* of those *Martyrs*. Those who are in good health, *begg* of the *Martyrs* the conservation of it; and such as are afflicted with any *disease*, *beg* health. Those who are *barren*, *pray* that they may have *Children*; and those who have Children, that they may be preserved to them. In like manner, those who *travel*, *desire* the *Martyrs* to be the companions, or rather Guides of their Journey; and those who return safe, return also to give thanks for the benefit they have received; Not that they imagin they go to *Gods*; but they *beseech* and *pray* the *Martyrs* of *God*, as Heavenly Men, to be *Intercessours* to Him for them. Now that such as piously and faithfully *pray* to them, *obtain* their *desires*: The *Donaries*, when they pay their Vows, do witness, as evident *Testimonies* of their recovered *health*. For some hang up the resemblances of *Eyes*; others of *Hands*, others of *Feet*, made of Gold or Silver: which their *Lord*, how small and vile soever the gifts be, disdains not most gratefully

to

'to accept, measuring the gift by the ability 'of the Giver. *These* therefore being expo- 'sed to the eyes of all Men, and brought by 'those who have obtained *health*, are most 'certain signs of the *Cure* of the *Diseases*. 'These I say shew the vertues of the *Martyrs* 'who lye buried there; and the vertue of 'the *Martyrs* declares the *God* whom they 'worshipped, to be the true *God*.

3*dly*, St. *Austin* is so copious in this subject, that he writes a *Treatise* rather than a *Chapter*, of the *Miracles* which were done in his time, at the *Shrines* of several *Martyrs*, particularly of St. *Stephen*, which those who desire to be informed of the Truth, may read at their leisure. I have instanced already in that of the *devout Mother*, who *exacted* of St. *Stephen* to restore her *Son* to life, and had her Petition *granted*, *God*, saith St. *Austin*, doing it *per Martyrem*, *by his Martyr*. I shall only add at present what he relates of a *poor*, but *pious* Man, called *Florentius*, who having lost his *Cloak*, and not having wherewith to buy another, went to the *twenty Martyrs*, (whose *memory*, saith he, *with us is very famous*, and *pray'd* with a loud voice, to be *cloathed*: Certain *young Men*, whom St. *Austin* calls *Irrisores*, (i. e. *scoffers*) hearing him pray, *derided* him, (as no doubt

De Civ. Dei. li. 22. *c.* 8.

Chap. 4.

Dr. *St.* would have done, had he been there) *as if he had begg'd ſo much money of the Martyrs, as would buy him a Cloak.* But he departing from thence towards the Sea-ſide, found *a great Fiſh* upon the ſhore, in whoſe Belly, when open'd, there was found a *Gold Ring*; which the Cook, a *good Chriſtian*, to whom he had ſold the *Fiſh*, and knew what had paſſed, gave him, with theſe words: *Behold how the Twenty Martyrs have cloathed Thee.* Thus St. *Auſtin*, little thinking, *then*, or *now*, (if he know nothing of what paſſes here below) what *ſport* this *ſtory* will make for the *Doctor* and his Partizans; though he good Man judg'd it worthy to be recounted, that *God* might be *glorified in his Saints.* And upon the ſame account I ſhall not omit, though it may add matter of new *Merriment* to the *ſcoffing* humour of the Age, to ſet down what I find related by *John Patriarch* of *JERUSALEM*, to have paſſed in this kind with Saint *John Damaſcen*, about the Year 728. He is known to have been a ſtout Aſſerter of the *Veneration* of *Holy Images*, and when the Emperour *Leo Iſauricus* raiſed a Perſecution for that cauſe, he wrote divers learned *Epiſtles* to confirm the *Faithful* in the *Tradition* of the Church. He was then at *Damaſcus*, where the *Prince* of the *Saracens* kept his Court, and highly in the favour of that *Prince* for his *Wiſdom* and *Learning*;

Learning; And the Emperor *Leo* not knowing otherwiſe how to execute his Fury againſt him, cauſes a Letter to be forged, as from *Damaſcen* to Him, and to be tranſcribed by One who could exactly imitate his hand; the Contents whereof were to invite him to paſs that way with his *Army*, with promiſe to deliver the *City* into his hands. This Letter the Emperor, (as out of friendſhip to an *Ally*, and deteſtation of the *Treachery*,) ſent to the *Prince* of the *Saracens*, who no ſooner ſaw and read it, but in a brutiſh Paſſion, commanded the right hand of *Damaſcen*, which he ſuppoſed had writ it, to be cut off. *Dictum Factum.* A word and a blow. His *hand* was *ſtruck* off, and hung up in the Market-place, till Evening; when upon Petition that he might have leave to bury it, it was commanded to be delivered to him. He takes the *hand*, and inſtead of laying it in the *Ground*, *joins* it to his *Arm*, and proſtrating himſelf before an Image of our *B. Lady*, which he kept in his *Oratory*, humbly *beſought* her Interceſſion for the reſtoring of his hand, that he might employ it in ſetting forth her *Son*'s praiſes, and *Hers*: This done, *ſleep* ſeiz'd on him, and he beheld the *Image* of the *B. Virgin* looking upon him with a pleaſant aſpect, and telling Him, that his *Hand was reſtored*; which when he awaked he found to be *true*, and a

ſmall

ſmall *Circle* or *mark* only remaining in the place where it had been cut off, to teſtify the truth of the *Miracle:* This is recorded by *John Patriarch* of *Jeruſalem*, in the Life of St. *John Damaſcen*, and to this I might add many more of the like kind: But theſe may ſuffice to ſatisfy an Impartial mind, that whether the *Saints themſelves hear us or no*, yet thoſe who implore their Interceſſion are moſt *certainly heard*, and as St. *Auſtin* ſaith, *helped by them:* And it can never be *unlawful*, much leſs *Idolatrous* to uſe *that means* for the obtaining our juſt deſires, which *God* himſelf hath *atteſted* by ſo many *Miracles* to be acceptable to him. All that the Doctor brings to uphold his ſlippery conſequence, is that *it would be a ſenſleſs thing to deſire ſome excellent Perſon in the Indies, when we are at our ſolemn devotion to pray for us.* And ſo, no doubt he would have derided thoſe *three Tribunes*, who (being unjuſtly condemn'd by the Emperor *Conſtantine*, commended themſelves to the Prayers of St. *Nicholas* at that time far from the Court,) for *double Innocents.* But *God* who is every where *preſent*, and to whom the *Wiſdom* of the *World* is *Fooliſhneſs*, both could and did reward the ſimplicity of their Devotion, by cauſing

De Cura pro mort. Cap. 15.

Vita S. Nicol. apud Lipoman.

the

the Holy Man to appear to the *Emperour* in his ſleep, and divert him from executing the *Sentence*. In fine, if the Doctor will needs have it to be a *ſenſleſs* thing to call upon the *Saints* in *Heaven* for the Aſſiſtance of their *Prayers*, he muſt either *condemn* the *Lights* both of the *Greek* and *Latin* Church (as Mr. *Thorndike* calls them) to have been *ſenſleſs Men*, (and they may thank *God* they eſcape *ſo*) or he muſt *grant* this *practiſe* of theirs, to be a convincing Argument, that *they believed the Saints did hear them.*

§. 4. The laſt thing he quarrels at, is the *ſetting up the Images of Saints in ſome higher place of the Church, and burning Incenſe before them.* And what he ſays to ſhow this to be very *Evil*, is that which proves it to be very *Good*, viz. That the *Perſons*, for whoſe ſake this is done, are (as we ſuppoſe them) truly ſuch, as for their *aſſured ſanctity*, would deſerve to have it done to *themſelves*, though perhaps *Humility*, or other *Moral* Conſiderations might weigh both with *them*, and the *Church* not to permit it to be done. Yet we know, that *Elias* ſate upon the top of a Hill, and call'd Fire from Heaven upon thoſe two Captains, who came to *ſeize* him; but condeſcended to go with the third, who *fell on his Knees before Him.* And I would gladly be inform'd what *Evil* at all it would be to ſet a *Saint* (were he preſent) in ſome

higher

higher Place in the *Church*, (as we do a *Bi-ſhop*) for the People to *ſee* Him, and deſire his *Prayers*. Perhaps it is the ſmoke of the *Incenſe*, which troubles his Eyes, that he cannot diſtinguiſh between the *uſe* of it, as applyed to *God*, and as applyed to his *Servants*, or other *things* relating to him. But *this* being of its own nature an indifferent *Ceremony* (as *bowing* and *kneeling* alſo are) and not appropriated (at leaſt in the *new Law*) to the worſhip of *God*, it is in the freedome of the *Church* to determine *how* and *when* it ſhall be uſed. And as when we *kneel* to *God*, that *poſture* is a *ſign* of the *ſoveraign honour* we give to *him*, as the *Lord* of all things: but when we do it to a *Holy Man*, or our *Parents*, it is but a ſign of an *Inferiour reſpect* due to them. So likewiſe the *Ceremony* of *Incenſe*, when directed to *God*, ſignifies the worſhip we owe to *him*; but to *Holy Perſons* or things, an *Inferiour reſpect* or *veneration* to them for his ſake. The *uſe* of it is very *ancient* as *Bellarmin* ſhows, and the *ſignifications* many, and very fitly adapted to the *Publick Service* of *God*, as well for the *Reverence* of the *Place*: as to mind us of the *Inacceſſible Glory* of *God*, who appeared in a *Cloud*; and the *ſweet Odour* our *Prayers* are to him, if ſent up from a *heart* inflamed with the *love* of God.

Li.2.de Miſſa.c.15.

God. This then being the *Intention* of *Catholick* People in the uſe of theſe and the like *Ceremonies*, viz. to give only a *Honourary reſpect* or *Veneration to the Saints*, and to deſire them only to *pray for us*, it is evident that neither in the *place*, nor the *time*, nor the *manner*, any *incroachment at all is made upon the worſhip and ſervice due to God alone*; and all the Dr. hath done in this *Paragraff*, was, to endeavour to *tye* a *knot* in a *Bull-ruſh*, when he could find none, and the matter was ſo *brittle*, that it would not hold the *tying*. §. 14. p. 168.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Practiſe of Chriſtian People in St. Auſtin's *time, in the Invocation of Saints.*

§. 1. THe *ſecond Anſwer* I gave to the Dr.'s *Injurious Parallel* of the *Heathens Worſhip* of their *Inferiour Deities*, and the *worſhip* given by *Catholicks* to the *Saints*, was, *that the ſame Calumny* (as St. *Auſtin* calls it) *was caſt upon the Catholicks in his time, and is anſwered by him, and his Anſwer will ſerve now as well as then. That Himſelf held ſuch Formal Invocation a part of the Worſhip due to Saints, as is evident from the Prayer he made to St. Cyprian after his Martyrdome; Let B. Cyprian therefore help us with his Prayers*, &c. And for a farther Confirmation of it, I added, *that Calvin himſelf acknowledgeth it was the cuſtome at that time to ſay, Holy Mary, or Holy Peter pray for us.*

Li. 20. *contra Fauſt. c.* 21.

Li. 7. *de Bapt. contr. Donat. c.* 1.

Inſtit. li. 3. *c.* 20. *nu.* 22.

The *Dr.* comes now, as he ſaith (p. 170.) to

to consider the Answer of St. Austin, whether it will serve to vindicate us now as well as then: And I must desire the Reader to take the pains to peruse attentively the words of St. *Austin*, as they stand cited in the *Reply*, and the Doctor's *Considerations* upon them (for himself thought not fit to call them an *Answer*,) that by his Performance in this Point, he may see to what miserable *shifts*, and disengenuous *Arts they* are put, who will *shut their Eyes*, and fight against the *light* of a *Noon-day* Truth.

§. 2. His *first Consideration* is, that St. *Austin* utterly denies that *any Religious worship was performed to the Martyrs.* And how could he affirm this, if he had not *shut* his *Eyes*, when St. *Austin* says expressly in the place cited, that *it was the custom of the Christian People in his time, to celebrate with* Religious *Solemnity the Memories of the Martyrs?* That the Reader might not see this Contradiction, he corrupts the words of St. *Austin* by translating them after his mode, Viz. *It was the Custome of the Christians in his time to have their Religious Assemblies at the Sepulchres or Memories of the Martyrs:* As if their *Meetings* were only to honour *God* in Himself, and not his *Martyrs* for his sake. But this is both expressly opposite to the words themselves; and is refuted by St. *Austin* himself, when having admitted in

Answer

Anſwer to *Fauſtus* his Objection, that *Chriſtians did celebrate the Memories of the Martyrs with Religious Solemnity*, he declares himſelf not to ſpeak of that *Religious Worſhip* which is due only to God, but ſuch a kind of worſhip, with *which even Holy Men in this life are worſhipped. We worſhip therefore*, ſaith he, *the Martyrs with that worſhip of Love and Society*, &c. *But we worſhip them ſo much more devoutly*, than we do Holy Men upon Earth, *becauſe more ſecurely, after they have overcome all the Dangers and Incertainties of this Life.* He that hath but *half* an *Eye* open muſt ſee, that St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks here of the *Worſhip* which the *Chriſtians* of his time gave to the *Martyrs themſelves*. And that the *Dr.* doth but *Equivocate* in the term [*Religious worſhip*] which may *reaſonably* be applyed to the *honour* due to the *Saints*, as I ſhewed above in the 2*d.* Chap. And whereas he ſaith, that I *conveniently* left out, what St. *Auſtin* adds, that *not only Sacrifice was refuſed by Saints and Angels, but any other Religious honour, which is due to God himſelf, as the Angel forbad St. John to fall down and Worſhip Him*; had *He* not *conveniently* put thoſe words [*any other Religious honour*] into the Text (for they are not in St. *Auſtin*) he had had nothing to *blind* his Reader with; and yet as himſelf cites the words, it is evident that St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks of *ſuch Religious honour, as*

is

is due to God himself. Whoever looks into the Text (which I omitted only for brevities sake) will judge he had done much *more conveniently* for his cause, had he left it out.

§. 3. His *second Consideration*, is, (p. 171) *that Invocation is expresly excluded by St. Austin, as no part of the Worship due to Saints.* And how again without *shutting* his *Eyes*, could he affirm this, when St. *Austin* expresly says, that *Christians did celebrate the Memories of the Martyrs with Religious Solemnity, not only to excite to the Imitation of their Vertues, but also to be partakers of their Merits, and to obtain help by their Prayers?* This he *conveniently* avoids the repeating of, and flies for refuge to another place of St. *Austin*, where he saith, *We raise no Altars on which to sacrifice to Martyrs, but to One God, the God of Martyrs, as well as ours; at which as Men of God who have overcome the World by Confession of Him, they are named in their place and order, but are not invocated by the Priest who sacrifices.* And here he thinks he hath done our work for us. For, *This* (saith the afore-cited Bish. *Forbes*) *is a Testimony in which all Dissenters wonderfully exult, and even Triumph; But those of the Church of*

De Civitat. Dei. li. 22. c. 10.

Consid. Mod. c. 4. p. 317.

Rome, ſaith he, *do anſwer, and indeed truly, that St. Auſtin ſpeaks here of Invocation in the Liturgy, and at the Altar, where foraſmuch as Sacrifice is truly offered to God,* (though he think many of the *Church* of *Rome* miſtaken in their Explication of it) *Invocation is to be directed to God alone.* And that this was St. *Auſtin's* meaning in that place, would have appeared from the Reaſon he gives, in the words immediately following the *Doctor's* citation, had he not moſt *conveniently* left them out, Viz. *Becauſe the Prieſt*, ſaith St. *Auſtin*, *ſacrifices to God, and not to the Martyrs, although he ſacrifice in Memory of the Martyrs, for he is the Prieſt of God, and not of the Martyrs:* Who ſees not, that St. *Auſtin* here ſpeaks of *Invocation* made by the *Prieſt* at the *Offering* of the *Sacrifice?*

§. 4. But that He did allow at other times the *direct Invocation* of *Saints*, I have already ſhown in the 4*th.* and 5*th.* Chapters, from the Examples of the *devout Mother* exacting of St. *Stephen* the reſtoring her Son to Life; and of the *poor Man*, who *prayed* to the *Twenty Martyrs* to be *cloathed.* Both which St. *Auſtin* highly commends, and relates them no doubt as *patterns* for our *Imitation.* In his 17*th.* Sermon *de verbis Apoſtoli*, he expreſly affirms, that *it is an Injury to pray for a Martyr, to whoſe Prayers we ought*

to

to be commended. And in his Book of the Care for the Dead, *c.* 4. & 5. he ſaith, that the Chriſtians of his time, did not only recommend the *Souls* of their *deceaſed Friends* to *God*, but to the *Martyrs* alſo, as *their Patrons* to be helped by them: And this he gives for the Reaſon, why they deſired to have their *Bodies* buried neer the *Shrines* or *Sepulchers* of the *Martyrs*, Viz. *That the Memory of the Place where they were buried, might excite their Friends to recommend them by their Prayers to thoſe very Saints.* Theſe Teſtimonies are ſo clear, that they cannot poſſibly be evaded by any ſhift, or pretence whatſoever of *Rhetorical Apoſtrophes*, or *Poetical Flouriſhes*, or *General Wiſhes* that the Saints would pray for us. And although Biſhop *Mountague* with his piercing Wit, being preſs'd with theſe Authorities, ſought every chink to eſcape out at, yet Biſh. *Forbes* (c. 4. p. 320.) confeſſes it was in vain; and *that he is very ſorry, that the ſaid Biſh. Mountague gave ſo juſt a cauſe to Joannes Barclaius to expoſtulate with Him, for impoſing upon the credulity of his Soveraign, and others in this matter.* And had he been now alive, he might with grief enough have pronounced the ſame (as I doubt not but many other learned *Proteſtanas* do) of Dr. *Stillingfleet.* As for what he quotes to have been

Parænli.2.c.7.

obſerved by *Lud. Vives* (if his Obſervation were true) that *many Chriſtians in his time did* offend in *re bona*, in *a thing good in it ſelf*, (which the Doctor leaves out) *becauſe they did*, ſaith he, *no otherwiſe worſhip Saints, than they did God himſelf*, (the contrary whereof is aſſerted by St. *Auſtin* of the *Chriſtians* of his time,) it imports at moſt but an *Errour* or *Abuſe* in ſome *particular Perſons*, ſuch as St. *Auſtin* ſaith (in the place above-cited againſt *Fauſtus*) that *whoever falls into it, is to be reproved by ſound Doctrine, that he may be either corrected or avoided.*

§. 4. From St. *Auſtin's* Teſtimony of the *cuſtome* of *Chriſtian People* in his time, I paſſed to his *Practice*, and for a Proof of it, I inſtanced in the *Prayer* he made to St. *Cyprian after his Martyrdome*, in theſe words; *Let bleſſed Cyprian therefore help Us with his Prayers*, &c. This the Doctor calls an *Apoſtrophe*, that is a *Counterfeit Invocation*, ſuch as Mr. *Perkins* ſaid, we *Engliſh men make to a Bowl, when we pray it, (globum rogamus) to rubb or run*; And the *compariſon* being ſo *Parallel* between Mr. *Perkins's Globum rogamus*, and St. *Chryſoſtom's Sanctos rogamus*, I cannot but wonder, that *Engliſh-*

L.i.7.de Bapt.contr. Donat. c. 1.

Hom. 26. in 2 Cor.

Engliſh-men who are generally eſteemed the *beſt Invocators* of *Bowls* in the World, ſhould nevertheleſs be no better *Invocators of Saints*. For, if the *devotion* be the *ſame*, it can be no more *Idolatry* to call upon the *Saints*, than upon the *Bowls*. But to ſpeak to the words of St. *Auſtin*, [*Let B. Cyprian therefore help us with his Prayers*] whoever conſiders the *Motive* alledged by Him, why he addreſſed himſelf to St. *Cyprian*, which was for that in Heaven, *He ſaw more clearly the truth of that Queſtion*, of which himſelf had formerly doubted, and St. *Auſtin* was then treating of; and the *neceſſity* he had of his Prayers, *as being yet in this Mortal Fleſh, and labouring as in a dark Cloud*; will eaſily ſee that it was not *a counterfeit*, but a *true* and *ſerious* addreſs to *Him* for the aſſiſtance of his *Prayers:* And *Chemnitius* no doubt underſtood it ſo, when ſpeaking of this very paſſage of St. *Auſtin's invocating* St. *Cyprian: This*, ſaith he, *Auſtin did, ſuffering himſelf to be carried away with the Times, and Cuſtome.* Well, but for all this, the Doctor will have it to be a *wiſh, rather than a Prayer, and he doubts his ſaying the like to* St. *Auſtin, Let Bleſſed Auſtin now help me with his Prayers, would not be taken by us for a renouncing the Proteſtant Doctrine, and embracing that of the Church of Rome.* *Exam. part.* 3. *p.* 211.

To this I Anſwer, although the word *Adjuvet* taken *Grammatically*, be of the *wiſhing* or *Optative Mood*; yet taken with all the *circumſtances* above-mention'd, and the *cuſtome* of *Chriſtian* People of that time approved by St. *Auſtin*, it imports as much a *formal requeſt*, as if a *Child* ſhould ſay to his *Father*, *Benedicat*, *Let my Father bleſs me:* For it is not ſo much the *Mood*, as the *Mode* (that is, uſe and cuſtome) which determins the *ſenſe* of *words:* And if the Doctor will hazard a tryal of it, Let him but profeſs as St. *Auſtin* did, that we ought to *celebrate with Religious Solemnity the Memories of the Martyrs, to be aſſiſted by their Prayers*; and that it is *good* and *lawful* to *commend our ſelves to their Prayers*; and upon this account ſay, as St. *Auſtin* ſaid, *Let B. Cyprian help me with his Prayers*, I dare undertake his *own Party* ſhall take it for *renouncing the Proteſtant Doctrine, and embracing that of the Church of Rome.* But he is ſo far either from making this *Profeſſion* with St. *Auſtin*, or ſaying to him, *Let B. Auſtin now help me with his Prayers*, that he would have the Reader to take it for *one* of the *ſuperſtitions*, which he would give us to underſtand, *crept in after the Anniverſary Meetings at the Sepulchers of the Martyrs, grew in requeſt. For* S. *Auſtin himſelf*, ſaith he, *affirmeth, that what they taught*

Contr. Fauſtum. li. 20. c. 21.

taught was one thing, and what they did bear with was another, ſpeaking of the cuſtomes uſed at thoſe Solemnities. And is it poſſible he could think ſo great a *Forb* as this could paſs for *current* in the World? Is it poſſible he could have *courage* enough to cite the place, where thoſe words are to be found, and not fear a *Rat?* Obſerve I pray: What St. *Auſtin* condemns in that place is this, that *ſome* who brought *Wine* and *Meat* to the *Sepulchers* of the *Martyrs*, took ſo plentifully of them, that *they made themſelves drunk.* His words are theſe, *As for thoſe who make themſelves drunk at the Sepulchers of the Martyrs, how can they be approved by us, whom ſound Doctrine condemns, even when they do it in their own private Houſes.* This was the cuſtome of which St. *Auſtin* ſaith, that the Governours of the Church *did not teach it, but bore with, till it could be amended.* And the Doctor had the *Conſcience*, by a ſubtil Inſinuation, to make his Reader believe, that what St. *Auſtin* condemned, was the *deſiring*, or, as he calls it, *wiſhing* the *Martyrs to pray for them.* I ſhall leave him to make *ſatisfaction* to *God* and the *World*, and proceed to that which he calls the *Queſtion between us.*

§. 5. *The Queſtion between us*, ſaith he, *is not how far ſuch wiſhes, rather than prayers, being uttered occaſionally, as* St. *Auſtin doth*

this to St. *Cyprian, but whether ſolemn Invocation of Saints in the duties of Religious Worſhip, as it is now practiſed in the Roman Church, were ever practiſed in* St. *Auſtin's time? This he utterly denies, and here,* ſaith he, (p. 174.) *we ſtand and fix our Foot againſt all oppoſition whatſoever.* Thus expiring *Candle* gathers up its ſpirits, and forces it ſelf into a *blaze* before it dies. Alas! that ſo many *learned* Men ſhould all this while have been *miſtaken* in the Queſtion! that they ſhould have ſpent ſo much *oyl* and *ſweat* to no purpoſe! The great Queſtion hitherto controverted between Catholicks and Proteſtants, was held to be, *Whether it be lawful to Invocate the Saints to pray for Us?* and *whether this were agreeable to the practiſe of the Primitive times?* But now, like a *miſchievous Card* that will ſpoil the *hand, this* is *dropt* under the Table, and all the *ſhow* above-board, is, whether it may be done in the *duties* (as he calls them) *of Religious Worſhip?* He ſaw how often his *Foot* had *ſlipt*, whilſt he endeavoured to *ſtand* upon the denial, of its being the cuſtome of the *Fathers* to *deſire* the *Saints* to pray for them; and therefore he catches hold of this *Twigg* to ſave himſelf, but in vain; for Biſhop *Forbes* confeſſes that it was their *cuſtome* to do ſo, both in *publick* and *private prayers*; although

Conſid. Mod. p. 308.

though he be loath to give it any other name but that of *wiſhing*. But *Chemnitius*, (*That great Light of the German Church*, as our Doctor calls him in his *Irenicum*, p. 396. where he ſets him in the *Van* for aſſerting the *mutability* of *Church-Government*, and *of whom*, he ſaith, *Brightman had ſo high an Opinion, as to make Him to be one of the Angels in the Churches of the Revelation*) this *great Man*, without mincing the matter, acknowledges freely, that *Invocation of Saints began to be brought into the publick Aſſemblies of the Church by Baſil, Niſſen, and Nazianzen, who lived in the Century before St. Auſtin:* and could little doubt of the Continuance of it in St. *Auſtin's* time, when he witneſſeth that *Chriſtian People did then celebrate the Memories of the Martyrs with Religious Solemnity, to obtain the Aſſiſtance of their Prayers*; But who can tell us what the Doctor means by the *duties* of *Religious Worſhip?* If he mean *hearing of Sermons*, (which is ſo much cry'd up by thoſe of his Party, as if it were the *Pro* and *Poop* of Religion, though the *Author of the Cauſes of the Decay of Chriſtian Piety*, Ch. 18. call it *the moſt lazie of all Religious Offices*;) he knows the *Invocation* of *Saints* was both *commended* and *practiſed* in their *Sermons*, by St. *Baſil.* Hom. in 40. Mart. S. *Greg.* *Exam. Conc. Trid. part. 3. p. 200.*

Greg. Nazianz. Orat. 20. & 21. *S. Greg. Nissen.* Orat. de S. Theodoro, and others. If he mean the *Letanies*, although the use of them began to be more *solemn* in the time of *Gregory the Great*, yet *Strabo* affirms that, *that form* of *Invocating* the *Saints* was believed to be much more *Ancient*: Viz. *from the time that* St. *Hierom translated the Epitome of Eusebius his Martyrologe into Latin*: or, (as others explicate his meaning) before that time, but not in so great a number. But then again, if he speak of that Part of the *Mass*, which was anciently called the *Mass* of the *Catechumeni*, and serves as a *Preparatory* devotion, both to Priest and People, the *Priest* indeed before he ascends to the *Altar*, desires the *B. Virgin*, and the rest of the *Saints*, as also the *People*, *to pray to our Lord God for him*, and in the *Versicles* between the *Epistle* and *Gospel*, there are some Instances (though very rare) of *Holy Mary*, or *Holy Paul pray for us*; but as these are not excluded by St. *Austin*, who speaks only of the Priest's directing his *Invocation* to *God* alone in the *offering* of the *sacrifice*; so neither can the Doctor give any satisfactory *Reason*, why the *Priest* may not lawfully use it then, (especially being appointed by the Church,) as in his private Oratory. But if he mean that *Part* of the *Mass*, which begins

De reb. Eccl. c. 28.

gins from the *Offertory*, and was anciently call'd the *Maſs* of the *Faithful*, in which the Prieſt addreſſes himſelf expreſly to *offer* up the *ſacrifice* of the *New Teſtament*, which *Chriſt* hath Inſtituted in his own *Body* and *Blood*; Let him, if he can, (for, he ſaith, *he hath look'd into our Miſſals*) produce any *one* Inſtance of *Formal Invocation* to any *Saint* or *Angel*. There they are *named* at this day (as they were in St. *Auſtin's* time) *in their place and Order*, but are not *Invocated* by the Prieſt that Sacrifices: So that in *this*, which is the *moſt proper* and peculiar *duty* of *Religious Worſhip* (as I have ſhown in the 3*d*. Chap. it was accounted by St. *Auſtin*) there is a moſt perfect *Conformity* between the *Primitive* and *Modern* Church: and the *difference* in other leſs ſolemn parts of Devotion, *not* at all *material*, as hath been ſhewed.

§. 6. In the laſt place (p. 174.) the Doctor ſaith, *He is ſent from* S. *Auſtin to Calvin, whoſe Authority, (though never owned as Infallible by Him) he need not*, as he ſaith, *fear in this point*; and therefore the *Errand*, (if he will have it ſo,) could not be *ungrateful*. I may well think his heart leap'd for joy to hear *Calvin* alledged for a *witneſs*, that *it was the cuſtome in* St. *Auſtin's time to ſay, Holy Peter pray for Us*: and thereupon, as if the *day* were his *own*, he ſays, *He cannot but wonder*,

der, that if I saw the words in Calvin, or Bellarmin, that I would produce them. But hold: Have not I more Reason to *wonder* at his *wonder*, if it be true what Himself makes *Calvin* to say, Viz. *That the Council of Carthage did forbid praying to Saints, lest the publick prayers should be corrupted by such kind of Addresses, Holy Peter pray for us?* For why, I pray, was such a Decree made, and why did the *Fathers* of that *Council* fear, lest the *publick prayers* should be corrupted with *such kind* of addresses, if there were *no such custome* at that time? Either the *Dr. corrupts* the words of his dear *Master Calvin*, or, it is manifest, they *imply* it was the *custome* at that time to say, *Holy Peter pray for Us.* And to make this clearer, I shall set down, 1. What *Calvin really* saith. 2. What *Bellarmin* answers to him. And from both it will appear, that *Calvin* supposes there was such a *custome*; and withall that *Calvin* hath *corrupted* the words and meaning of the *Council*, and D. *St.* misrepresented those of *Calvin.*

1. What *Calvin really* saith, is this, viz. *That it was anciently forbidden in the Council of Carthage that direct prayer or Invocation be made to the Saints at the Altar. And it is probable*, the reason was, *for that those Holy Men, when they could not totally Repress the force of an evil Custome,* they

Instit. li. 3. c. 20. n. 22.

they thought good at leaſt to put this reſtraint upon it, leſt the publick prayers might be corrupted with this Forme, Holy Peter pray for Us. This is what *Calvin* ſaith. And who ſees not, that *the cuſtome* (no wonder if *He* call it an *ill* one.) *whoſe force*, he ſuppoſeth, *the Council would, but could not totally Repreſs*, was *this form* of addreſs, *Holy Peter pray for Us?* And He that ſees this, muſt ſhut his Eyes, if he ſees not that in *Calvin*'s Opinion, it was the *Cuſtome* of that time (however *reprovable* he would make it) to ſay, *Holy Peter pray for Us.* For how could he make the *reſtraining* that *Cuſtome*, to be the reaſon of the *Law*, if he did not *ſuppoſe* there was ſuch a *cuſtome*, and that a *forcible* one too? But then again, who ſees not, that for fear the Reader ſhould ſee this, the Dr. moſt conveniently left out of his citation thoſe words of *Calvin*, which were moſt material to the preſent purpoſe [*viz.* that the *Decree* was made *to forbid direct praying to Saints at the Altar, and the Reaſon in his Opinion, why thoſe Fathers made that Decree, was to reſtrain the force of an evil cuſtome, which they could not totally Repreſs?*] For had theſe words been put down, the thing had been too clear to be denied, *viz.* that *Calvin acknowledged there was ſuch a cuſtome at that time:* As in a like caſe, if the *Elders* ſhould make a *Sanction*, that hereafter it ſhall not be lawful for Dr.

St. to misreport the words and sense of their Patriarch *Calvin*; and I should say, that in my Opinion, the Reason would be to *restrain* the *force* of an *evil custom*, which they could not *totally repress* in him, of doing it in most of the Authors he cites; I dare confidently aver, he would not stick to charge me, that I said, he had *such a custom:* which if he think good to do, the many *instances* I have brought of his *insincere* dealing in this kind, will more than sufficiently acquit me.

2. What *Bellarmin* (*de sanct. beat. li.* 1. *c.* 16.) answers to this Objection of *Calvin*, is, that *Calvin* corrupted the words and sense of the *Council*, when he said, that what it forbad, was *to make direct Prayer or Invocation to Saints at the Altar*, because the *Council* speaks not at all of *praying to Saints*, but only ordains that *the prayer of him that sacrifices be directed to the Father*, and *not* to the *Son*. He says indeed, that *Calvin* by *his Logick* deduces *that*, because *prayer* is to be *directed* to the *Father*, therfore *the Saints may not be Invocated:* and then farther, that *the Council decreed*, *that that form of Invocation*, *Holy Peter pray for us*, *should not be used*. And this I can easily believe was *Calvin's ultimate design* in corrupting the *Canon* of the *Council*. But where doth *Bellarmin* say, that there *was no such custome* in St. *Austin's* time; or that *Calvin* said, there was *no such custome* at that time? Why then is it made a wonder,

that

that *if I ſaw the words in Calvin or Bellarmin, I would produce them?* The *Reaſon* was, to make the *Reader* believe, that *himſelf* could not poſſibly be *guilty* at that very time of a *crime*, which he imputed to his *Adverſary*. But whoever conſiders the *nature* of the *cauſe*, he hath undertaken, will ſee *no cauſe* to *wonder* at this procedure, becauſe it is the *natural effect* of ſuch a *cauſe*, to put the maintainer upon the deſperate ſhift of miſ-repreſenting the words and ſenſe of Authors, and no Man wonders at a *natural* effect, eſpecially if it be *frequent*, as *this* of the Doctor's is.

§. 7. But now the *blaze* is ſpent, and there only remains a little *ſmoke*, viz. that *I may as well the next time bring St. Auſtin's Teſtimony for worſhipping of Martyrs, Images, and Angels, becauſe he ſaith, he knew many who adored Sepulchers and Pictures, and had tryed to go to God by praying to Angels.* What this [*as well*] relates to, I cannot tell; but I am ſure he uſes the *ſame Art* here, in bringing *theſe Teſtimonies* againſt us, which he did before in alledging the *cuſtom* of thoſe who made themſelves *drunk* at the *Sepulchers* of the *Martyrs*. For either S. *Auſtin* ſpeaks here of the *Errours* of ſuch as were profeſſed *Hereticks*; or, if any who profeſſed themſelves *Catholicks* fell into them, they were the *Errors* of particular *Perſons*, (though many,) and juſtly *reproved* by him: Whereas the *Cuſtom* of *Invocating* the *Saints* to pray for us,

us, was the *Universal practice* of *Christians* at that time, *not reproved*, but *owned*, *practised*, and *abetted* by the most Religious *Bishops* and *Fathers* of the Primitive *Church*, and by St. *Austin* himself, as hath been shown: and by *more*, or *all after their time*, as Mr. *Thorndike* confesses. Wherefore if the Doctor be still resolved to keep his *standing* against so great a strength of Authority, and give *no more satisfactory account* hereafter, than he hath already done, of charging the *Roman Church* with *Idolatry*: It is manifest, that his Foot *sticks fast* (as the *Psalmist* saith) *in the deep Mire*, *where no ground is*: or, to speak in Mr. *Thorndike*'s language, in the depth of *Schism*: From whence, that he may be drawn out before *the Flood run over him*, is the hearty wish of Him, who *honours* his *Person* and *Parts*, whilst he detects his *Sophistry*, and refutes his *Calumnies*.

FINIS.